



Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Effectiveness of Campus Wi-Fi on Students Academic Performance among College Students in one 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>
The manuscript addresses a relevant issue because campus Wi-Fi is now important in college learning, especially for online quizzes, assignments, research, and LMS access. However, the paper still needs stronger methodological clarity because the conclusions sometimes sound broader than what the self-reported and correlational data can support.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The study should clarify how academic performance was measured. At present, it appears to be based on students' perceived impact rather than actual academic records such as GPA or grades. This is important because the title and conclusion suggest effects on academic performance, but perception data cannot fully prove actual performance improvement.
The discussion and conclusion should be more careful in interpreting the correlation results. A strong positive correlation does not mean that campus Wi-Fi caused better academic performance. Other factors, such as students' study habits, digital skills, course requirements, or access to personal devices, may also influence the result.



The methodology needs more detail on the sampling process and questionnaire. Although the paper mentions stratified random sampling, the online distribution through student channels and social networking groups may introduce response bias. The manuscript should explain how randomness and proportional representation were actually ensured.

The study would be stronger if it included more critical analysis of the high ratings. Most results are very effective but the reported challenges on coverage, weak signal, and slow connection during peak hours show some inconsistency. The authors should discuss this more deeply instead of mainly presenting the findings as highly positive.

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 initiative of the authors is commendable. The paper tackles a very practical and timely issue, especially since the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) is heavily pushing for ICT integration in our institutions. Targeting a smaller city like Kabankalan to fill the gap left by urban-centric studies is a good rationale.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The title and the abstract boldly claim to assess the effectiveness of Wi-Fi on Students' Academic Performance. But if you look closely at their methodology, Part V of their questionnaire only assessed the perceived impact of Wi-Fi on academic performance. They correlated students' perceptions of Wi-Fi with their own perceptions of how it helps them. This is common method variance. Basically, they are proving that students think good Wi-Fi helps them study better, which is pretty obvious. The authors actually admitted this in their limitations, stating they did not use objective metrics like grade point averages. For an academic journal, this is a fatal flaw. They must either revise the title and entire framing of the paper to Perceived Academic Support/Impact OR they need to revise the study to correlate the Wi-Fi ratings with the students' actual GWA/GPA.
The statistical tools used were limited to frequencies, percentages, weighted means, and Pearson r. But for an academic journal, simple bivariate correlation is usually not enough. The authors found a strong correlation for connection speed ($r = 0.754$). However, since they have demographic data like year level and academic program (like BSIT vs. BEED), they missed a huge opportunity. Do IT students require different Wi-Fi reliability compared to Education students? I highly recommend using multivariate analysis, like Multiple Linear Regression. This will tell us which specific dimension of Wi-Fi (accessibility, speed, reliability, or coverage) actually predicts academic impact the strongest when controlling for variables like the student's course or year level.



The study is confined to just one private school in Kabankalan City. While the context of a developing Philippine city is interesting, international readers and reviewers will ask, "How does a single-school study with 350 students contribute to the global body of knowledge?". The authors need to strengthen their Discussion section. They need to deeply anchor their findings on existing theories of digital divide or technology acceptance. They should explain why the situation in this specific private school reflects broader systemic issues in developing nations, making the findings relevant to a global audience.

The questionnaire uses a standard 4-point Likert scale. However, looking at the academic activities, the options are "Always, Often, Sometimes, Never". Then in Table 6, they use statements like "Helps complete assignments more efficiently" with a descriptive rating of "Very Effective". It is slightly confusing how the scale points were labeled across different parts of the survey. Ensure consistency in reporting the scale. If Table 6 measures agreement or frequency, the descriptive rating "Very Effective" might be a mismatch for the actual survey questions asked. Clarify the anchoring of the scale.

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.			