International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines

Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Sustaining Graduate Futures: An Institutional Tracer Study of Employability, Work Transition, and Future-Ready Competencies in a Philippine Local College
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

General Comments and Recommendations
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

General Comments and Recommendations
This manuscript presents an evaluation of graduate outcomes at a local Philippine college. As an academic administrator dedicated to quality assurance and outcomes based education, I find the empirical basis of this research commendable. The authors connect institutional data with national frameworks like those from the Commission on Higher Education.

Specific Comments and Recommendations
Title: The title is informative but slightly verbose. The author should delete 'Future Ready' to ensure conciseness.
Abstract: The abstract provides a clear summary of the research. However, the author states that 50.9 percent of respondents hold employment. This figure is deceptive because it includes self employed individuals. The author must clarify this distinction early.
Introduction: The introduction adequately frames the study within local and international contexts. In section 1.1, the text references 'A recent Philippine studies'. The author must correct this pluralization error to 'A recent Philippine study'. Furthermore, the objectives in section 1.2 lack punctuation at the end of the third bullet point.

International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines

Methodology: Section 2.3 notes an overall response rate of 45.8 percent. This rate introduces significant bias. The author must explicitly describe steps taken to mitigate nonresponse bias. Furthermore, the reliance on 'available case analysis' in section 2.4 weakens the statistical rigor. The author must justify this choice over other data imputation methods.
Results: Section 3.1 highlights that the Bachelor of Science in Criminology program only achieved a 36.7 percent response rate. Conclusions drawn from such a low participation level are suspect. Section 3.3 reveals that 43.9 percent of respondents have an unspecified employment status. The author must address this flaw directly in the text.
Discussion: Section 4.1 attempts to explain the low Criminology employment rate via references to recruitment cycles and physical requirements. These explanations seem speculative because the author presents no survey data to support them. The author must anchor these claims in qualitative evidence from the open ended survey responses or remove them entirely.
Conclusion: The conclusion accurately reflects the data but lacks a forceful academic voice. It repeats statistical figures already discussed in earlier sections. The author should synthesize the core message rather than list percentages again. The call for a coordinated graduate transition system is sound. The author must specify which administrative office should lead this system.
Recommendations: The recommendations are actionable and institution specific. Point 5 suggests course embedded assessment. The author must define what this phrase means in the context of this specific college. Point 9 suggests annual quality assurance. The author should recommend specific rubrics for this process.
Suggested Institutional Indicators: Table 12 proposes targets for future cycles. A global audience will not benefit from these highly specific local targets. The author should move this section to an appendix or reframe it as a generalized model for other institutions to adopt. References: The reference list is current and correctly formatted for the most part. However, the institutional data sources at the very end lack proper retrieval dates or publication details. The author must format these internal documents to meet standard academic conventions.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

	Decision
	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.

International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines

Reviewer 2

General Comments and Recommendations
The paper has useful institutional data and the topic is relevant, but I still see some serious analytical problems affecting the main conclusions. My concern is not on presentation but whether some important interpretations are really supported by the design and analysis used.
Specific Comments and Recommendations
The cohort pattern is interpreted too strongly as effect of time since graduation. The study is cross-sectional and descriptive, yet the manuscript repeatedly treats the higher employment among older cohorts as evidence that employability develops over time and even states that transition time is confirmed as important. These are different graduating cohorts observed only once, not the same graduates followed longitudinally. Cohort-specific labor market conditions, program composition, respondent selection, and other historical differences cannot be separated from elapsed time. This is a major issue because the cohort gradient becomes one of the central arguments of the whole paper.
The evidence supporting the competency priorities and qualitative themes is methodologically weak. The competency gaps are only differences between two means, mostly very small at 0.09 to 0.17 on a five-point scale, but no variability, uncertainty, or statistical test is given to establish whether these differences are meaningful. At the same time, the qualitative part is described only as coding through a rule-based thematic dictionary, without clear basis for how the dictionary was developed, validated, or checked for coding reliability. These two analyses are later used to identify institutional priorities, especially digital/AI literacy, critical thinking, practical preparation, and career services. The strength of these claims is therefore much higher than the analytical evidence can presently support.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

	Decision
	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.

International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines

SECOND ROUND

Decision	**Editor**	**Reviewer 1**	**Reviewer 2**
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.			