

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>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>Yes. This research can provide information for teachers when teaching scientific writing to students</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>References are good, but the way to write citations is not clear. The citation does not include the year of publication.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | Yes | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | This article deserves to be published. However, it is necessary to improve the research method section, namely the validity of the data. The author has not explained it. | |

PART 2:

| | 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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Indrya Mulyaningsih |
| Department, University & Country | Universitas Islam Negeri Siber Syekh Nurjati, Indonesia |