

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_96087
Title of the Manuscript:	MIGRATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. The issue discussed in this manuscript is very important to understand the causes of the brain drain in terms of teachers in the Philippines. But in this manuscript, the author has failed to introduce the topic adequately in the INTRODUCTION section. The gap discussed in this section is not sufficient to justify why this study is important in the context of the Philippine to be undertaken. The author should specifically explain in the context of the Philippines what is the study gap. 2. Yes, title is Ok 3. No- the abstract doesn't show the purpose of the study, major findings, the methodology adopted, implications of the study and conclusion etc. 4. The authors need to follow the standard format of the journal for writing this research paper. Different sections have been provided but not properly ordered. My suggestion is to reorganize all the sections properly, especially the result section where the author should exactly demonstrate the results according to the research questions of this study. Likewise, the conclusion is accurate and needs to rewrite based on the findings of this study. Remove the number of points in the conclusion section 5. The gap is missing although statement of the problem has been provided; the LTR review is not sufficient to support the study RQs; the Methodology explanation is ok; however, the findings are not very original; I didn't see anything new in the findings; there is no need to provide the theoretical framework of the study as it is required in the quantitative research, however, if the author is supporting his stances with help of a theory then the correction will be required at this stage; the conclusion is not correct; discussion is disorganized and doesn't show how the research questions were addressed in this study. 6. The in-text cited studies are mostly miss in the reference list. The author should provide a solid LTR review to support the study objectives.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Proof-reads will be required	
Optional/General comments		

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Asad Khan
Department, University & Country	University of Peshawar, Pakistan