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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.** | The manuscript is important for the scientific and educational community because it studies an understudied interface between entrepreneurial mindset and interest in health-related startups among senior high school  students from the Philippine context. Applying a rigorous mixed-methods approach, the study quantified entrepreneurial tendencies and elucidated nuanced underlying motivations and barriers for students when  considering ventures in the health sector. These could have implications for curriculum developments, targeted  support programs, and policy interventions to promote youth entrepreneurship in socially relevant fields, such as health and wellness. The study also offers baseline data for the continuation of work by scholars and educators in upgrading entrepreneurial ecosystems within educational institutions. | Thank you for the opportunity to respond. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Yes, the title of the article: “The Entrepreneurial Mindset and Health-related Startup Interests of Grade 12 ABM Students at a Medical School in Davao: A Mixed-Methods Study” is generally clear and descriptive, however, it  is quite long and could be slightly streamlined for clarity and impact. It could be rephrased as *“Entrepreneurial*  *Mindset and Interest in Health Startups Among Grade 12 ABM Students in Davao: A Mixed-Methods Study”* | Thank you for the suggestion regarding the title. We agree that the current version, while informative, may be overly lengthy. We will revise it to:  *“Entrepreneurial Mindset and Interest in Health Startups Among Grade 12*  *ABM Students in Davao: A Mixed-Methods Study.”* This version retains accuracy while improving clarity and readability. |
| 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 lacks certain crucial information that can be added on a few levels to improve clarity and conciseness.  1. Right now, the abstract does mention 66 students in the quantitative phase and 15 in the qualitative phase, but only in the methodology. Summarizing this briefly again in the results would provide the reader with context without forcing one to re-read the methods. Add: "Among 66 surveyed students and 15 interview participants."  2. You report "no statistically significant relationship," but mean scores suggesting a generally high entrepreneurial mindset and health-related interest are buried in the text.  Suggestion: Mention the mean scores in the results sentence (e.g., "The mean entrepreneurial mindset score was  3.94, and the mean health-related startup interest score was 3.61.")  3. Some statements repeat the same idea ("external factors, rather than internal entrepreneurial tendencies, may be more influential," then again "interest appears driven more by social relevance..."). These could be combined. Put these two sentences together, giving a clearer explanation. | We appreciate the detailed observations on improving the abstract. We will revise it to include the following improvements:  1. Brief mention of sample sizes in the results section.  2. Include the mean scores for entrepreneurial mindset (3.94) and health-related startup interest (3.61) to contextualize the findings more effectively.  3. Merge the two similar sentences on external vs. internal motivations to avoid redundancy and improve flow. |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct in its design, implementation, and analysis, but it will be significantly strengthened by:   clarifying instrument validation,   aligning conclusions with results,   reporting effect sizes, and   clearly stating limitations regarding sample size and selection bias. | Thank you for recognizing the scientific rigor of the manuscript. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention**  **them in the review form.** | The fact that most sources are from 2020-2024 shows that the study is leveraged on the current literature (Akkaya et al., 2024; Degefu et al., 2024; Indrianti et al., 2024). The citations cover topics such as entrepreneurial mindset,  health startups, self-efficacy, and innovation, which align with and well embody the theme of this study. | Thank you for the positive feedback regarding the quality and currency of the references. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | There are recurrent issues that should be addressed to meet a polished scholarly standard:  1. Some sentences restate the same ideas (e.g., motivations for entrepreneurship are repeated multiple times in slightly different wording).  2. Inconsistent Tense and Agreement. Example: *“This means that the students are greatly interested...”*  (correct), but later: *“Many students is driven...”* (incorrect).   Suggestion: Review subject-verb agreement carefully.  3. Phrases such as *“this means that the students are only moderately entrepreneurial”* could be made more formal (e.g., *“indicating a moderate level of entrepreneurial orientation”*).  4. Some sentences are excessively long and could be split for clarity. Long sentences should be broken into shorter, clear statements.   There are occasional missing articles, inconsistent comma use, and awkward phrasing. | Thank you for the detailed language suggestions. |
| **Optional/General** comments | The study is relevant and well designed but an alignment of conclusions with results, good language editing, and fuller discussions of limitations and instrument validation are very much needed**.** | We sincerely appreciate the constructive feedback. |

**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?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | There are no ethical issues in this manuscript. All participants were informed about the purpose of the study, and informed consent was obtained prior to their participation. The research was conducted in accordance with ethical guidelines for studies involving human subjects. |