

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJARR_118708 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Metacognitive Awareness of Writing Strategies, Oral Proficiency, and Writing Instructions: A Structural Equation Model of Academic Writing Skills in Filipino Language |
| Type of the Article | |

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript is quite important for the scientific community in enriching scientific knowledge. 2. The title is in accordance with the discussion of the manuscript that has been presented. 3. The abstract needs to be revised and adjusted to the topic and main problems expressed by the author. 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. References are appropriate but still need to be added with updated references. <p>Clear enough</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <p>The quality is good, but the sentences need to be adjusted if there are changes in the text according to what has been commented.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>No.</p> | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <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> |
|---|--|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Name: | Abdul Karim |
| Department, University & Country | Universitas Bosowa, Indonesia |