



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Buberian Concept of Dialogical Existence: A Pathway to Reconciliation
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 discusses a relevant philosophical topic and connects Buber's dialogical existence with reconciliation and peace. However, the paper still needs stronger analytical focus because several parts repeat the same ideas instead of developing a clearer argument.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The methodology needs to be clearer and more specific. Since the study is philosophical and conceptual, the authors should explain more directly how the texts were selected, analyzed, and interpreted. This is important because the strength of this type of paper depends on a transparent analytical process.
The distinction between Results and Discussion is not yet strong. Some parts of the Results already include interpretation, while the Discussion repeats many points from the earlier sections. The authors should reorganize these sections so the Results present the main conceptual findings and the Discussion explains their meaning and contribution.
The Philippine context is mentioned, but it is not fully developed. The manuscript refers to conflict, polarization, Mindanao, and online hostility, but these examples need deeper



connection to Buber's I-Thou framework. This will make the paper more relevant and less general.

The references and theoretical grounding need better consistency. Some important sources are repeated, and some citations appear incomplete or not fully aligned with the reference list. Strengthening this part will improve the credibility of the manuscript and make the argument more acceptable for an international journal.

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>
I read this manuscript with much attention and deep interest. The application of Martin Buber's dialogical existence to modern personal and social conflicts is a very fascinating and relevant topic, specially focusing on the Philippine context. You have a very rich theoretical foundation here.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The title is okay, but the abstract is weak. You started with, "The exploration of this paper presents...". This is very unnatural phrasing. A paper does not explore itself. Just say, "This paper explores..." The abstract must be a sharp snapshot. Right now, it reads too much like a background story. You need to clearly state the problem, the specific methodology, and the ultimate conclusion in a punchy way.
Your transition from general conflict to the Philippine context (Mindanao, historical injustices, political rivalry) is a very strong angle. But it jumps too suddenly. One moment you are talking about Pope Francis and self-alienation, and immediately the next paragraph is about the Philippines. You must build a smoother logical bridge here. You stated your Research Questions and Research Objectives separately. In an international journal, this wastes space. Merge your objectives into your introduction narrative naturally.
Your literature review is decent, bringing in contemporary scholars like Lederach (2020), Couldry and Hepp (2021), and Abu-Nimer and Nelson (2021). However, you are heavily summarizing them one by one. You need to synthesize. Do not just say "Author A says X. Author B says Y." Instead, show how Author A and Author B agree or disagree, and where the gap is that your paper will fill.
The methodology section is quite problematic for a philosophical study. You claim you used "recent scholarly studies (2020 - present)". But how did you choose them? What were your inclusion and exclusion criteria? For a journal, you cannot just say you picked credible sources; you must be transparent about your data-gathering framework to assure academic quality. You



also wrote, "There are no human participants in the study as it is only conceptual". This is obvious and does not need to be stated in a philosophical paper. Remove it.

You divided "Results" and "Discussion" into two different chapters. In your Results, you made a list of Themes (Theme 1 to Theme 4) and gave very short paragraphs. Then, in the Discussion, you practically repeated the exact same concepts. In philosophical and hermeneutic studies, you do not separate the "Results" from the "Discussion." You must merge them. Use your Themes as your main section headings, and put all your deep Buberian analysis, Levinasian ethics comparisons, and Habermas theories directly under those themes. This will stop the annoying repetitions. You wrote: "The results of the study is presented in this chapter...". This is a grammar error ("results... are"). Please proofread carefully.

The conclusion is too brief and dry. It just repeats the abstract. A good conclusion must leave a lasting impact. What is the practical implication of your finding for Philippine educational leadership, policy-making, or peace-building? Give the readers a strong takeaway.

You separated "Books" and "Journals" in the reference. APA 7th format does not do this. All references must be in one single alphabetical list. You have multiple duplicate entries:

- Fitzpatrick (2020) is listed twice.
- Gruz, Soares, & Mai (2023) is listed twice.
- Uyheng & Carley (2023) is listed twice.
- Vasist, Chatterjee, & Krishnan (2023) is listed twice.
- Wegerif & Major (2020) is actually listed three times.

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.			