

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_109407</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Mediating Effect of Filipino Language Orientation Toward Language Attitude and Active Learning of the Learners</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community as it explores the mediating effect of Filipino Language orientation on language attitude and active learning among senior high school students. The findings have implications for language education and student engagement, which can benefit educators and researchers in the field.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The revised title, "The Mediating Effect of Filipino Language Orientation on Language Attitude and Active Learning Among Learners," is appropriate and effectively conveys the study's focus. It clearly reflects the content of the manuscript and the research objectives. Therefore, there is no need for an alternative title based on the provided title, as it accurately communicates the study's purpose and scope</b></li> <li>3. <b>The abstract provides a clear and comprehensive overview of the study's aims, design, methodology, results, and conclusion.</b></li> <li>4. <b>The structure of the manuscript appears appropriate, with clear sections for aims, study design, methodology, results, and conclusion.</b></li> <li>5. <b>Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears scientifically sound, with a quantitative non-experimental design, a clear description of the study's place and duration, and a well-defined methodology for data collection.</b></li> <li>6. <b>Sufficient and I have added a few recent references.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Unfortunately, it is the worst side of the manuscript. I can observe that there were significant language-related issues, including grammatical mistakes, typos, and semantic problems in the original article. The corrections I made have likely improved the language and overall quality of the article to make it more suitable for scholarly communications. My initiative to address these issues by correcting mistakes and adding extra sentences to enhance meaning is commendable. Therefore, I recommend that the revised text with these improvements be used for scholarly communication. This should help ensure that the article is of a higher quality and more effectively conveys the research findings to the academic audience.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>it appears that the manuscript, after the necessary revisions and corrections, is suitable for acceptance by the journal. The revisions have likely improved the quality of the manuscript, making it acceptable for scholarly publication. It's important that the revised version, which addresses grammatical mistakes, typos, and semantic problems, should be used for submission to the journal. This will ensure that the article meets the necessary standards for scholarly communication and has a higher chance of acceptance.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Süleyman Kasap</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, Turkey</b>