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| 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.** | This manuscript addresses a critical issue in education—the connection between literacy and numeracy, specifically how reading comprehension influences mathematical word problem-solving. The study is timely and relevant, particularly in contexts like the Philippines, where reading and math competencies are national concerns. By linking comprehension levels (literal, inferential, critical) to math problem-solving performance, the paper provides actionable insights for improving interdisciplinary instruction. It contributes to pedagogical strategies in secondary education and supports ongoing reforms in educational policy and practice. | Thank you for your positive feedback. We acknowledge the importance of aligning our findings with educational reforms. We will revise the discussion to better emphasize how our study supports integrated instruction and current DepEd initiatives in improving both literacy and numeracy. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Yes, the title is suitable and clearly reflects the content and scope of the research. No changes are necessary. | Thank you for the feedback. We are glad that the title is clear and appropriate. No changes will be made. |
| 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 is concise and captures the research objective, methodology, key findings, and implications well. However, it could be slightly improved by:   * Including the sample size (100 Grade 7 students) for clarity. * Mentioning the statistical method used (Pearson’s correlation) to strengthen the summary of findings.   **Suggested addition:**  “Using Pearson’s correlation analysis on data from 100 Grade 7 students...” | Thank you for the helpful suggestion. We have revised the abstract to include the sample size and the statistical method used: “Using Pearson’s correlation analysis on data from 100 Grade 7 students...” |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound. The theoretical framework (Cognitive Load Theory) is appropriate, and the predictive-correlational design aligns with the research objectives. The instruments are adapted from previous validated studies, and the analysis is coherent. The conclusions are supported by the results. The manuscript demonstrates an adequate understanding of educational psychology and quantitative methods. | Thank you for your positive evaluation. We appreciate your recognition of the study’s methodological alignment and theoretical foundation. No further changes will be made in this section. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | Yes, the references are sufficient and include a good mix of foundational (Sweller, 1988; Oakhill et al., 2003) and recent (Bayazit & Öztürk, 2021; Ng & Lee, 2019) studies. However, a few more references from the last 2–3 years (2022–2024) could further strengthen the literature base. If available, including studies from similar developing-country contexts would be useful. | Thank you for the suggestion. We will add recent references from 2022–2024, including studies from similar developing-country contexts, to further strengthen the literature review and provide updated insights. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Generally yes, the English is clear and understandable. However, there are a few areas where grammar and phrasing can be improved for clarity and academic tone. For instance:   * “This part measures students' skills in analyzing and solving word problems using complete and accurate solutions.” → consider rephrasing for formality. * Some verb tenses can be made more consistent.   A light proofreading is recommended, but the language is acceptable overall. | Thank you for your feedback on language clarity and tone. We have revised the paragraph to improve formality, rephrased the noted sentence, and ensured consistency in verb tenses. A light proofreading has also been completed. |
| Optional/General comments | * The conceptual framework figure appears twice and should be presented only once. * Table formatting could be improved for better readability (e.g., align column headings and data properly). * The Likert-scale interpretation should be referenced more clearly (which study/formula was adapted). * Ethical and privacy safeguards are well described and commendable.   **Recommendation: Minor Revision**  The manuscript is well-structured, relevant, and contributes meaningfully to the field. Only **minor language editing and formatting** adjustments are needed. | ● Thank you for pointing this out. The duplicate conceptual framework figure has been removed to avoid redundancy.  ● We appreciate your suggestion. Table formatting has been adjusted for better readability, ensuring proper alignment of headings and data.  ● The Likert-scale interpretation has been clarified by specifying that it was adapted from Pellegrino, Chudowsky, and Glaser (2001).  ● Thank you for acknowledging our efforts to address ethical and privacy safeguards. |
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