



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Transforming Creative Writing Instruction Through Dialogic Pedagogy Among Senior High School Learners
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 topic in creative writing instruction, especially the use of dialogic pedagogy to improve student voice, confidence, and writing performance. However, the paper needs major improvement in scholarly rigor, consistency of reporting, and completeness of qualitative and methodological details before it can be considered ready for publication.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The literature review contains repeated and very generic paragraphs that do not clearly connect to dialogic pedagogy or creative writing instruction. This weakens the theoretical foundation of the study and makes the review look unfinished.
The methodology needs more detail on how the 12-week dialogic intervention was actually implemented. Without clear description of classroom activities, teacher role, peer feedback process, and control group instruction, the study is difficult to replicate.



The quantitative analysis is useful, but the manuscript should explain why only post-test comparisons were used after baseline testing. A stronger analysis, such as ANCOVA or gain-score comparison, may better support the claim that the intervention caused the improvement.

There is an inconsistency in the reported effect sizes. The tables show moderate to large Cohen's d values, but the discussion reports much larger values for the same areas. This must be corrected because it affects the credibility of the findings.

The qualitative findings are too brief and lack participant quotations or deeper evidence. Since the study uses a mixed-methods design, the qualitative results should show how student statements support the themes.

Some claims in the discussion and conclusion are too strong. The study was conducted in one school with intact class sections, so the authors should be more careful in generalizing the findings.

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 want to congratulate the author for choosing a very timely and interesting topic. Bringing Bakhtinian dialogic pedagogy into the Senior High School (specifically the HUMSS track) creative writing classroom is a very good attempt to move away from rigid, teacher-centered methods. The mixed-methods approach (quasi-experimental combined with thematic analysis) is appropriate for this kind of pedagogical intervention study.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
There is a massive mismatch between the effect sizes (Cohen's d) presented in the Results section tables and what you discussed in the Discussion section. This makes me worry about the data integrity. Which numbers are the true ones? If the tables are correct, then your discussion is exaggerating the effects. If the discussion is correct, your tables are wrong. You must fix this immediately throughout the paper.
In both Section 2 (Literature Review) and Section 6 (Discussion), the exact same paragraph appears twice in an immediate row: "Furthermore, extensive research conducted by leading universities demonstrates significant correlations between various factors..." This paragraph does not contain any real citations or specific data - it reads completely like a generic placeholder text from a template that you forgot to delete. Having it repeated multiple



times damages the professionalism of the manuscript. Please remove these generic paragraphs entirely and replace them with actual, specific literature relevant to your variables.

At the very end of Section 7 (Conclusion), the text just stops in the middle of a thought: "That said, it's important to acknowledge some limitations in the study..." And then nothing follows! The actual limitations are completely missing. For a journal, you must explicitly state your limitations (e.g., sample size limited to one urban school, lack of long-term retention tests for writing self-efficacy, potential teacher bias if you taught the classes yourself).

Section 1: Introduction

The language used in the Abstract and Introduction is sometimes too casual for an academic journal. Phrases like "ran a 12-week classroom intervention", "stuck with traditional", and "feel a bit stuck in an old-fashioned mindset" should be rewritten using more academic language. For example, use "conducted a 12-week intervention" or "remained attached to traditional instruction".

Section 3: Methodology

Role of the Researcher: Who delivered the 12-week intervention? Did you teach both groups, or did different teachers do it? If it was you, how did you handle the threat to internal validity (expectancy effect)? If it was other teachers, how did you ensure they followed the "dialogic" style correctly? This needs clarification.

Sampling detail: You mentioned "homogeneous purposive sampling method" to pick the 120 students, but then said they were "intact, pre-existing classroom sections." If they were intact sections, this is convenient cluster selection rather than pure purposive sampling of individuals. Please clarify this terminology.

Section 5 & 6: Results and Discussion

In the qualitative findings (Themes 1, 2, and 3), you just summarized what participants said. To make a qualitative analysis strong, you must include direct quotes from the student journals or Focus Group Discussions (FGD) to support these themes. Without raw data/quotes, the qualitative phase looks weak. In the discussion, you mentioned the Initiate-Response-Evaluate (IRE) pattern. This is an excellent point. But you did not introduce this in the literature review. Please add a brief mention of the IRE pattern in Section 2 so the reader is prepared for it when it shows up in the discussion.

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.			