



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Project Reading Advancement through Practices and the Reading Competence of Grade 7 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 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 educational gap in reading comprehension among Filipino students. While the intention of the intervention is very good, the current manuscript struggles with methodological inconsistencies and structural flaws that weaken its scientific validity.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The paper claims to use "Simple random sampling". However, it also states that the 25 respondents were specifically chosen out of 73 learners because they were identified as facing challenges in reading proficiency. This is purposive sampling, not simple random sampling. A sample size of 25 respondents is generally considered too small for a robust quantitative experimental design. The research design is described as a "pretest-posttest experimental design without control group," but the very next sentence calls it a "quasi-experimental design". A single-group pretest-posttest is actually a pre-experimental design. Without a control group, it is very difficult to confidently claim that the reading improvements were solely due to the intervention and not other external factors.



The study states it uses a convergent parallel mixed methods design. The qualitative part mentions using a semi-structured interview and thematic analysis. However, in the results and discussion, the qualitative data (Section 4: Student's Perception) is presented as a summary paragraph without any direct quotes, specific themes, or rigorous qualitative coding shown. Qualitative findings must be presented with evidence (like excerpts from the students) to support the themes.

In "Section 5. Intervention plan", there are sentences that clearly belong to a journal writing template or rubric. Phrases like "Authors must identify weaknesses in the experimental design or the sample" and "The section concludes with recommendations for future inquiry" were left in the manuscript. This is a massive red flag for peer review and must be removed entirely.

The presentation of the statistical results is a bit disjointed. The t-test results table is floating in Section 3, and the interpretation jumps straight into P-values without thoroughly discussing the standard deviations or effect sizes. Effect size (like Cohen's d) should be reported to show the magnitude of the intervention's impact, not just the p-value.

Simplify the acknowledgement section because it is too long. Make it one paragraph only.

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 topic is relevant because reading difficulty among Grade 7 learners needs serious intervention. The manuscript also shows possible improvement after the reading activities. However, there is one major methodological concern that affects the validity of almost all results and conclusions.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The main problem is that the paper concludes that the reading program was effective even though it used only one group with pretest and posttest and without any control or comparison group. The significant paired t-test only confirms that the scores before and after the intervention were different. It cannot confirm that the intervention itself caused the improvement because other explanations, such as repeated testing, maturation, additional teacher support, other school activities, or regression to the mean, were not controlled. This is especially important because the 25 participants were selected due to their low reading performance. The manuscript also treats high t-values as "strong effects," although a t-value is not an effect-size measure, and it directly concludes that the strategies were effective. This unsupported causal interpretation is repeated in the conclusion.



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.			