|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| Journal Name: | [**Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies**](https://journalajl2c.com/index.php/AJL2C) |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_AJL2C\_135394** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **The Influence of Autonomy, Competence, and Relatedness in Reading on Senior High School Students’ Motivation to Read** |
| Type of the Article | **Original Research Article** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | I think it’s a valuable contribution, especially because it uses the Self-Determination Theory in the Philippine educational context, where more localized studies like this are needed. The work provides solid evidence that competence, autonomy, and relatedness all play important roles in students’ reading motivation, and it can definitely help educators develop better reading programs. | Yes it is, thank you for these insights. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Yes, I think the title is clear and well-matched to the paper’s focus. It accurately describes the study's key variables and audience.  No changes needed. | It is indeed matched the focus of the study. |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract covers the main points of the study well. However, it could be made even stronger by including a quick mention of the most important statistical finding, like the 47.5% variance explained (R² = 0.475), to show the strength of the results. Also, mentioning the Philippine setting early in the abstract would make the study’s relevance more obvious from the start.  Overall the abstract is good. | Thank you for the suggestions, I’ll go ahead and apply it for better flow of my paper. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The paper has good scientific foundations.  The methodology is suitable for the study topics and is adequately explained.  To investigate the correlations between variables, multiple regression analysis was a wise approach.  There is a clear discussion of principles of ethics.  The study is technically sound and well-executed overall. | These are overwhelming feedbacks. Thank you. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references are recent and sufficient. The fact that the majority of the references are from 2019 to 2024 indicates that the author stayed up to date with the most recent findings. It would strengthen the introduction even more if it were feasible to include one or two fairly recent research from 2024. | Thank you, I assure that all the citations are credible. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language is clear and understandable.  There are a few sentences that could be made a little more concise, but they do not affect the meaning.  Maybe a final language check (for style and flow) would make the paper sound even more polished for publication. | Thanks for this. |
| Optional/General comments | The conceptual framework is simple to comprehend, and the paper is really well-structured.  There was appropriate attention to ethical principles, which is important.  I liked how the author clearly connected the findings to existing theories like Self-Determination Theory.   Suggestions for improvements:  **-**Adding a short section about the limitations of the study (for example, the use of self-reported data or the focus on only two campuses) would make the discussion more complete.  -It might also be helpful to suggest future research directions briefly, like exploring the same variables across public schools or different regions. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** |  | I think, None, as I have follow ethical considerations religiously |