



Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Savoring Meaning: A Rhetorical Study of Linguistic Identity and Persuasion in Philippine Food and Beverage Branding
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 paper has an interesting and relevant topic, especially because Filipino food and beverage taglines are part of everyday advertising and culture. The use of McQuarrie and Mick's rhetorical theory is also appropriate, and the authors were able to show many examples from actual taglines.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The paper repeatedly states that the linguistic devices contribute to brand recall and persuasion, but the study only analyzed the taglines as texts. There were no consumers, no recall test, no interview, no survey, and no evidence showing how audiences actually remembered or were persuaded by these taglines. Because of this, the conclusion sometimes becomes too strong compared to what the data can really support. I suggest that the authors revise the framing of the study and make it clear that the paper only identifies and interprets rhetorical and linguistic devices in Filipino food and beverage taglines. If the authors want to keep the claims on brand recall and persuasion, they need to add empirical data from



consumers. Otherwise, the words “brand recall” and “consumer persuasion” should be treated only as possible implications, not as proven 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 commend the authors for taking on an interesting topic about Philippine food and beverage branding. The contextualization of local linguistic identity and cultural values in advertising is a very relevant pursuit. The mapping of the linguistic devices based on McQuarrie and Mick's framework is organized.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The abstract and introduction explicitly state that the study examines taglines "in relation to brand recall and consumer persuasion". However, the methodology is purely a qualitative textual analysis of 50 taglines. You cannot establish actual consumer persuasion or brand recall without empirical data from the consumers themselves (e.g., surveys, market data, or experimental research). The current results only identify the linguistic devices used, but they do not prove how effective these are in actually persuading the market. The authors must revise their objectives to strictly reflect textual analysis or overhaul the study to include quantitative consumer data.
The manuscript still contains remnants of a thesis format that are completely inappropriate for a journal article. For example, detailing that the researchers "asked permission from the research chairperson," "research adviser," and "the panel chair" is unnecessary. These internal administrative procedures must be removed to align with standard academic publishing formats.
In the Data Analysis section, the authors mentioned that the data was subjected to a validation process by "three recognized language experts". This is methodologically weak as it stands. What were the specific criteria for this validation? How was inter-rater reliability established? For a journal, you need to provide transparent and replicable methods, not just state that experts looked at it.
The connection to SDG 4 and SDG 12 in the abstract and introduction feels highly forced and speculative. Merely analyzing the linguistic tricks of corporate advertising does not automatically translate to promoting "sustainable consumption behavior". If the authors wish to retain this claim, they must provide a much stronger, evidence-based discussion on exactly how textual rhetorical figures directly trigger sustainable practices in a fast-paced economy. Otherwise, I suggest removing the SDG claims entirely to keep the paper focused.



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.			