

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_95537
Title of the Manuscript:	THE KNOWLEDGE PROVIDED TO STUDENTS OF SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION THROUGH SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS: A QUALITATIVE APPROACH
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.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>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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Can you provide part of your semi structured interview? Did one person analyse all the data or was it a team? If so, how? 89 interviews are a lot, and there must be methods beyond the methodology listed.</p> <p>Huge downside is a few extremely large quotes. Much better would be small snippets of multiple participants to give a flavour. By giving only a few block quotes, only one perspective is given, limiting the audience's view. Many quotes are too long and need shortened and focused.</p> <p>Huge downside is you are really quantitative, giving frequencies in parentheses. What is missing is the negative, e.g., you state 8 of 13. What about the other 5? For example, later you devote a whole section to only 1 teacher.</p> <p>You give a very detailed account about Bourdieu and others, but I do not clearly see the connection. You need to clearly connect with your findings. For example, you summarize habitus and cultural arbitrary, but you do not connect these terms to your present study.</p> <p>Rather small bibliography.</p> <p>Long title. Shorten it and connect to the study's primary purposes.</p> <p>Do you have means to stake claims about validity/reliability (some would say trustworthiness).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>shorten quotes/add more; clearly connect the discussion to the findings; rather light on references (add 15-20 more). Make the fixes quickly and the paper should be acceptable.</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:	David C. Coker
Department, University & Country	Fort Hays State University, USA