

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_96275
Title of the Manuscript:	HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES OF DISABILITY AND SPECIAL EDUCATION IN ZAMBIA
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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Title:</b></p> <p>Historical Perspectives of Distability and Special Education in Zambia</p> <p><b>The reviewer's comments</b> The subject matter of this theme is good and well worth pursuing. This manuscript is a worthy contribution to the study about historical perspectives of distability and special education in Zambia. However, the reviewer would like to see some revisions made to your manuscript before publication. In the section of the introduction, I suggest the authors should illuminate what new insight is your study offering to readers?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) In the section of the research method, the authors should illuminate which research method is used. Why do you use this research method? Please give justification.</li> <li>2) In the section of the discussion, I suggest the authors should provide more theoretical literatures to dialogue with the results.</li> <li>3) Please strengthen the conclusion. Good finding suggestions for future practitioners and researchers.</li> <li>4) English language and style are fine/minor spell check required</li> <li>5) This study is interesting and innovative.. Accept after minor revision.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yi-Huang Shih
Department, University & Country	Ching Kuo Institute of Management and Health, Taiwan