

Paper: “Assessing Program Satisfaction and Employment Outcomes Among Bachelor of Science in Information Technology Graduates of Notre Dame of Jolo College”

Submitted: 24 February 2025

Accepted: 14 April 2025

Published: 30 April 2025

Corresponding Author: Edgar Jansol Acevedo

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n10p94

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tilahun Achaw
Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia

Reviewer 2: Faranak Seyyedi
Azad University of Arak, Iran

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Tilahun Achaw Messaria (PhD)	
University/Country: Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia	
Date Manuscript Received: 06/03/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 13/03/2025
Manuscript Title: Assessing the Program Experiences and Employment Outcomes of Notre Dame of Jolo College BSIT Graduates	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2
<i>I don't think the title by itself is clear, informative. Readers could understand it by reading the manuscript.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2
<i>The major objective/purpose of the study was not clearly reported rather a mere repetition of the title. The abstract is not the complete summary of the manuscript (e.g., the study target population and data collection tools were missing). The results were presented using terms such as 'most' and 'many'. The results should not be evaluative; rather a factual description of the results.</i>	

<i>Overall, it is too difficult to visualize the method and results of the study from the information provided.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<i>There are few interesting ideas and insights in the study. However, the weaknesses of the writing styles spoiled the communication of those insights and ideas. There are serious writing styles and formatting errors. The manuscript looks a draft than a finished document.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>The method in general and the population and sampling technique in particular were not adequately and clearly described. Information was not given regarding the total number graduates and the expected number of participants Why convenience sampling technique?</i> <i>Why Schomburg's (2016) tracer survey guide and CHED's tracer study questionnaire was adapted and used?</i> <i>Methods of data analyses employed were not discussed and presented in accordance with the research questions. And I don't think that appropriate statistical methods were used to answer the research questions.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>I don't think the research questions are addressed adequately and clearly. The study should have been delimited to some issues/research questions. It's was beyond the scope of this kind of study to address these five research questions.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>As compared with other sections, the conclusion is better.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are relatively recent and adequate.</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In addition to the above specific comments, I recommend you to proofread the manuscript before submission for a review as there are organizational and structural problems. It seems that the document is submitted in a hurry with little or no proofreading. Please be also focused on some of the research questions.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and addresses the main goals and content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The Abstract clearly summarises the content of the study goals, designs, and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The article is well-written without spelling and grammatical errors.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Some major concerns regarding the methodology should be addressed. The authors need to address the study's power and try to increase the sample size by including more recent graduate students. Also, they should clarify why they chose subjects by convenient sampling and didn't use cluster sampling. More details on statistics of questionnaire adaptation for data gathering are needed, such as what kind of validity and reliability tests the authors used.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is clear without errors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion clearly supports content and results.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference list is comprehensive and appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

These comments can help the authors to enhance the manuscript quality:

1. Authors have enrolled 57 subjects from 2017 to 2019; it is recommended to include newer cases and increase the sample size; otherwise, authors should clarify the power of study and how they have calculated their current sample size.
2. The author should mention study limitations such as convenience sampling, low sample size, and applying descriptive analysis rather than analytic analysis.
3. For the data gathering instrument, the authors only mentioned that they adapted Schomburg's questionnaire, and they mentioned that all statistics exceeded the 0.70 threshold. The authors need to attach the last version of the questionnaire as a supplementary file. Also, they should provide more information on the validation and adaptation of questionnaires, such as Cronbach's alpha values. What kind of validity did the authors measure (face validity or content)? What type of reliability test did they use?
4. In table 3, The reason behind dividing participants into groups is not clear. For instance, how do they reach to the cut-off values for monthly salary or duration of month to secure the first job.
5. Authors should provide future research concepts.
