



Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Bridging the Gap: The Lived Experiences of Dormitory Students on Digital Access
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers recognize the value of your manuscript and recommend revisions to further enhance 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>
This paper has a relevant and timely topic, and the lived experiences presented are meaningful, especially in showing how digital restriction in dormitory setting can affect both academic and social life of students. The manuscript has potential, but at present the main issue is the qualitative rigor and coherence of the analysis.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
My main concern is that the paper says it used phenomenology, but the analysis and presentation of findings do not yet clearly reflect a strong phenomenological treatment. The study only involved four participants, and while this can still be acceptable in qualitative work, the manuscript needs stronger justification of sample adequacy and much clearer explanation of how the themes were generated from the actual lived experiences. At present, the results look more like a descriptive thematic summary than a deeper phenomenological analysis of essence and meaning. Also, the methodology mentions thematic analysis, content analysis, and narrative analysis all together, but the paper does not clearly explain how these were combined and why all were needed. This makes the analytic process look unclear and weakens trust in the findings. Related to this, many conclusions and recommendations appear broader than what the small and localized dataset can strongly 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 authors for taking on this very relevant and timely study. The lived experiences of dormitory students regarding digital access is an interesting phenomenon, especially in the Philippine educational context where institutional rules often clash with modern learning demands. The paper has good potential and provides a localized perspective on the digital divide.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The current structure jumps immediately from the Results to the Conclusion. In qualitative research presenting the themes is not enough. You need a separate Discussion section where you interpret your findings and heavily interact with existing related literature. How do your specific findings about Academic Management or Social Connectivity compare with or contradict what is already published? The authors need to synthesize their data with current studies to show the actual contribution of this paper to the broader scientific community.
There seems to be an overlapping of analysis methods that makes the methodology confusing. The paper mentions using thematic analysis, supported by content analysis and narrative analysis. For a phenomenological study, using three different analytical frameworks is unnecessarily complicated and epistemologically conflicting. It is highly suggested to stick to one recognized phenomenological data analysis approach (for example, Colaizzi's or Moustakas' method) to establish rigor. Furthermore, a purposive sample of only four participants is quite small. While phenomenology does use small sample sizes, the authors must explicitly justify this. Please state in the methodology if data saturation was reached with these four participants, and how you determined that no new information was emerging.
The manuscript includes several direct quotes from the participants in Tagalog or Taglish, such as "nag aral na'ko... before pa pumasok sa dorm..." and "mahirap... mawalan ng connection sa pamilya". Since this paper is submitted to an international journal, you have to cater to an international audience. For every local quote provided in the results, please provide an accurate English translation enclosed in brackets or placed right beside the original statement.
You grounded the study in Jan van Dijk's Digital Divide Theory, which is a good choice. However, the theory is only mentioned in the Introduction and briefly dropped in the Conclusion. A theoretical framework should guide the analysis. In your new Discussion section, kindly use the components of van Dijk's theory (motivational, physical, skills, and usage access) as a lens



to interpret your themes. Explain exactly how the students' experiences of restricted access and their coping mechanisms demonstrate or expand upon van Dijk's concepts.

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.			