



Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Parental Involvement, School Engagement, and Online Learning Satisfaction of Junior High School English Learners
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the value of your manuscript and suggest revisions to improve its clarity, organization, and overall quality. In addition, you are required to conduct a thorough inventory of the references in your manuscript. Please ensure that only the sources cited within the text are included in the References section, and likewise, that all references listed in the References section are properly cited in the manuscript. For example, if you have 20 cited references in the manuscript, then only 20 references should be included in the References section. However, please note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single entry in the References list; therefore, the total number of entries in the References section may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The paper addresses a relevant topic and the variables are meaningful, especially in the context of online learning among junior high school English learners. However, in its present form, the manuscript has one major problem that affects the trustworthiness of the whole study. The statistical presentation and interpretation are not yet clear, internally consistent, and in some parts appear incorrect. Because of this, the reader cannot fully verify if the conclusions are really supported by the data. For me, this is the main issue that must be corrected first before the paper can be considered further.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The Results section needs major reworking because several tables and statistical statements do not align well with each other. For example, the regression section states that the predictors explained 45.5% of the variance, but elsewhere the text also mentions $R^2 = .44$, which is inconsistent. The correlation table is also difficult to interpret because the coefficients and p-values seem mixed or misplaced, and the entries do not follow a clear correlation matrix format. In the regression table, the confidence intervals are not properly reported, and the values shown do not look consistent with the beta coefficients and t-values. Even the participant profile table has questionable values, especially for age, where the mean, standard deviation, and range presentation appear implausible for Grade 10 learners. These are not small presentation issues



because they directly affect the credibility of the findings. I suggest the author revisit the raw outputs, reconstruct all statistical tables correctly, and make sure that every value reported in the text matches the tables exactly. Until this is corrected, the discussion and conclusion look stronger than what the presented evidence can safely support.

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>
First of all, I commend the author for taking the time to conduct this study on the online learning experiences of Junior High School English learners in Catholic private schools in Davao City. The paper tackles an important educational aspect, especially looking into how home and school factors worked together during the COVID-19 pandemic.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
1. Kindly double-check your Table 1 immediately. The age demographics are very problematic and impossible. You reported an age range of "11 (0-16)" and a standard deviation of 4.8 for Grade 10 students. Grade 10 students are usually around 15 to 16 years old. Having a 0-year-old or an 11-year-old in Grade 10 is highly unlikely, and this makes the whole dataset look questionable to reviewers.
2. In your abstract, you claimed that the study is grounded in ecological systems theory and student engagement frameworks. However, when I read your Introduction, there is no actual deep discussion of the Ecological Systems Theory. You only mentioned ecological perspective once in the Discussion section. A journal article requires a very strong theoretical framework that is woven from the introduction down to the interpretation of your results.
3. You mentioned that you used total enumeration and got 232 students across three private Catholic institutions. This means there are only about 77 Grade 10 English learners per school. For private schools in Davao City, this population size seems very small for an entire batch. Please clarify if this is really total enumeration of the whole Grade 10 batch, or if this was just the accessible population that agreed to answer your Google Forms.
4. Simply running Pearson correlation and multiple regression on self-reported survey data is usually not enough anymore to make a significant contribution to the literature. Since you have three main variables, you might want to consider doing Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) or testing for mediating/moderating effects, which you actually suggested yourself in your recommendations for future research.
5. There is a severe typographical error in your Conclusion section that needs to be deleted. You repeated the phrase "the understanding that effective online education extends beyond the screen and" three times in a single sentence. Aside from this, there are typos in your



abstract keywords like design and involvement, and in your introduction like "more essential" and "faith-based". A journal expects a polished manuscript.

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.			