



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Utilization of a Contextualized English Reading Module to Enhance Higher-Order Thinking Skills among Grade 10 Students through Socially Relevant Topics
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 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 an important concern in English reading instruction, especially the need to connect reading materials with students' real experiences while developing higher-order thinking skills. The study has practical value because it offers a module that teachers may use in actual classroom settings. However, the main weakness is the limited design, especially the absence of a comparison group, which makes the claim of effectiveness less strong.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The study used a single-group pretest–posttest design. While the increase in scores is clear, it is difficult to say that the improvement was caused mainly by the module. Other factors, such as regular English classes, Catch-Up Friday activities, or student maturation, may have influenced the results. This limitation should be treated more carefully in the interpretation.
The sample was limited to 42 students from one school. This makes the findings useful for the study site, but the manuscript should avoid making broad claims about Grade 10 Filipino



learners in general. The authors may need to present the findings as context-specific unless future studies with more schools are conducted.
The module appears well aligned with the selected social topics and HOTS, but the manuscript should explain more clearly how each lesson directly targeted a specific higher-order thinking skill. A stronger mapping between lesson activities, HOTS focus, and assessment items would make the module development more convincing.
The pretest and posttest were researcher-made, but the manuscript gives limited detail on the actual items and how they measured HOTS. Since the main outcome is higher-order thinking, the authors should provide clearer evidence that the test items assessed analysis, evaluation, problem-solving, critical thinking, and metacognition, not only reading comprehension.
The use of Phil-IRI BOSY and MOSY scores adds value, but these scores were affected by the whole school reading program and not only by the module. The authors should be more cautious in linking Phil-IRI improvement to the intervention.
The teacher evaluation of the module is useful, but the usability score was lower than the other areas. This point needs more attention because lesson duration and grade-level appropriateness affect whether teachers can realistically use the module in regular classes.
The discussion is generally strong, but it is quite lengthy and sometimes sounds more confident than the design allows. The authors should reduce overstatements and emphasize that the results suggest positive potential rather than confirm effectiveness in a broad sense.

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>
The authors address a very critical problem in the Philippine education setting, which is the struggle of students with English literacy and higher-order thinking skills. Trying to fix this by using reading modules that connect to the real social lives of the students is a very good and practical approach. The paper has a logical flow and the theoretical foundation using Vygotsky and Bloom is nice. However, I see several big weaknesses that you need to fix to make the study stronger. The main problem is the research design and how you claim the results. Because you do not have a control group, it is very risky to say the module alone caused the improvements. Your tone in some parts sounds too confident about the module being the main reason for success, which needs to be softened. Also, some references are not complete.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Introduction The background is written well. Mentioning the PISA results and the Education First index really shows why this study is needed. You talked about other reading programs like Catch-Up Friday



and ARAL-Reading. This is good context. But please make sure the transition from these big national programs to your specific local module is smoother. It feels a bit sudden.

Methodology

2.1 You wrote that this is a quasi-experimental, single-group pretest-posttest design. Many research experts would argue that a single-group design without any control group is actually a pre-experimental design, not quasi-experimental. Please double-check your textbook sources on this terminology and correct it if necessary.

2.2 You also chose 42 students out of 500 using convenient purposive sampling. Why these specific 42 students? Were they struggling readers? Were they just the students in one specific class section you handle? If you do not explain the criteria for choosing them, readers will think the sample is biased and maybe you just picked the smart students.

2.3 It is good that your instruments were validated by experts and tested for reliability. But for the teacher survey, you only used 10 English teachers from the locale. Ten is a very small number to confidently rank the HOTS deficits for the whole curriculum. You should acknowledge this small sample size as a limitation.

Results

For the Phil-IRI results comparing BOSY to MOSY, you have a confounding variable problem. You confess later in the paper that normal English classes and other DepEd activities happened at the exact same time. Because of this, it is almost impossible to prove that your module increased the Phil-IRI scores. You must rewrite this section to be very careful. Do not say the module strictly caused this; just say there was a positive trend during the time the module was used.

Discussion and Conclusion

The discussion correctly connects the findings back to the theories you mentioned in the introduction, like Walberg and Vygotsky. This shows good academic alignment. I am glad you admitted the absence of a control group is a big limitation. But please put this limitation earlier in your mindset when writing the conclusion so your final statements are not over-claiming. In the conclusion, you recommend the module for widespread use like in Catch-Up Fridays. Since you only tested 42 students in one school, maybe suggest that it should be pilot-tested first on a larger scale before full integration.

References

Please look at your reference list carefully. I found several entries that are incomplete and say they will be specified upon formal publication. Examples are Resuello et al. , Saro et al. , and Silfani et al.. You cannot use placeholder citations in a manuscript submitted for review. If they are not yet published, remove them and find alternative sources that are already available, or cite them properly as unpublished manuscripts if the rules allow it. Ensure all your DOIs are formatted the same way. Some use the https format and some use http. Be consistent.

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.			