

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_101782
Title of the Manuscript:	HANDLING LEARNERS WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS: THE LIVED EXPERIENCES OF ESL READING TEACHERS
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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it provides insight into teachers of special education learners.</p> <p>Yes, it is descriptive but it should probably mention the Philippines as phenomenological studies are context-dependent</p> <p>Yes but it should define ESL and LSEN before using those abbreviations</p> <p>Perhaps subsections need to be distinguished from sections more clearly.</p> <p>The author followed a careful procedure. Ethical approval was obtained. The author addresses several important aspect of qualitative and phenomenological work, including what makes a work reliable.</p> <p>Mostly. The theory being used is an older one but there are several newer references.</p> <p>The author has consciously and cautiously followed guidelines for this type of research, which is laudable.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English is pretty strong, but it could use some solid editing because occasionally it becomes awkward.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. I would like to know what questions were asked during the interview. Perhaps these could be included as an appendix?</p> <p>2. I am unfamiliar with the style of referencing. (And Creswell is references as 2013 and 2014 in different places).</p> <p>3. I would like to see more of a discussion of trustworthiness results.</p> <p>4. The author provides several sets of coded information. Were these taken from responses to different questions? Or did the author categorize responses in this manner?</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cynthia Whissell
Department, University & Country	Canada