



Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	A Study on the Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices on Solid Waste Management among High School Students in a Private School in Kabankalan City
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference whenever available to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please also note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
I commend you for taking on this very relevant study regarding solid waste management within your local context. The paper is generally well-written, and exploring the attitude-practice gap within a private, faith-based institution provides an interesting localized perspective.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
You mentioned the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) in the Discussion and Conclusion sections to explain your findings. However, your Introduction focuses strictly on the KAP (Knowledge, Attitudes, Practices) model and lacks any preliminary discussion of TPB. If you plan to use TPB to justify the perceived behavioral control bottleneck in your conclusion, you must introduce and integrate this theory early on in the Introduction to establish a cohesive framework.
Regarding your sample, you mentioned using Slovin's formula to determine a sample size of 310 from a population of 807 students. However, the specific sampling technique used to select



the actual 310 respondents from the population is completely missing. Since you are running a One-Way ANOVA to compare variables across all six grade levels, you need to explicitly clarify if you used stratified random sampling to ensure equal or proportional representation across the grades.

For the instrument's reliability, stating that the pilot study yielded an acceptable internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.70 or higher is too vague for a journal. You must state the exact Cronbach's alpha values computed for each specific section (Knowledge, Attitudes, Practices) rather than giving a general estimate. Additionally, the survey utilizes a five-point Likert scale for the 10-item awareness and 8-item attitude measures, but a four-point Likert scale for the 15-item practices measure. You need to briefly justify why an even scale was used for practices while an odd scale was used for the others, and explain how this was handled during your statistical treatment.

Table 1 displays the overall mean scores for Knowledge (4.17), Attitudes (3.34), and Practices (3.08) alongside their standard deviations. Yet, the manuscript does not provide the qualitative scoring scale or verbal interpretation matrix anywhere in the text. You repeatedly state in the abstract and discussion that respondents demonstrated Very High knowledge and attitudes and High practices. Without presenting the exact numerical ranges (e.g., 3.50-4.00 = High) for these verbal descriptions in your Methodology or Results, readers and reviewers cannot validate your claims. Please insert the scoring scale.

Your discussion effectively validates the KAP model and highlights the lack of campus infrastructure. However, please to connect your findings more robustly with international literature, rather than relying heavily on local or institutional context. Global waste management is a pressing issue, so linking your localized findings to broader ASEAN or global trends will improve the paper's international relevance.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
☐	Accept the manuscript for publication.
☐	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
☐	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The paper is timely and useful because solid waste management among students is really an important school and community concern. The manuscript is generally clear and the topic has practical value, especially for school administrators who want to improve students' environmental practices. However, the main concern is that the paper tends to make strong conclusions about an attitude-practice gap and the role of school infrastructure, but the study design and data presented do not fully support this interpretation yet. The results only show self-reported knowledge, attitudes, and practices, with correlations and group differences, but there is no direct evidence on actual campus waste facilities, availability of bins, observed



student behavior, or physical waste audit. Because of this, the discussion and conclusion sometimes go beyond what the data can safely claim.

Specific Comments and Recommendations

At present, the manuscript argues that students have high knowledge and attitude but only high practices, and from this it concludes that there is an attitude-practice gap caused by limited infrastructure or lack of accessible localized campus systems. This is an interesting and possible explanation, but it was not actually measured in the study. The questionnaire did not appear to include items on availability of segregation bins, classroom waste facilities, monitoring systems, or barriers to waste management. Also, since all variables are self-reported, the study cannot confirm whether students really practice SWM consistently or whether they only reported socially acceptable answers. I suggest that the authors revise the discussion and conclusion to make the claims more cautious. They may say that the findings suggest a possible gap between attitude and practice rather than firmly concluding that infrastructure is the bottleneck. If they want to keep this argument, they should add supporting data, such as student-reported barriers, observation of school waste facilities, or a simple waste audit.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			