

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_116948</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>An Extensive Review of Inclusive Education Research over the Past Decade: Concerns towards Children with Disabilities</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

[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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable? Title requires revision.</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? No.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is reasonably important for scientific community. The systematic review of the literature over a period of ten years in relation to the increasingly significant subject-matter of inclusive education as it pertains to children living with disabilities strikes at the very heart of educational inclusivity. A longitudinal approach to identifying patterns and directions of research into the subject-matter is significant for mapping out sustainable pathways for addressing issues revolving around inclusive education and children with disabilities.</p> <p>The author(s) may consider revising the title to align it with the research design and objectives. I would rather suggest the following alternative title: <b>“A Systematic Review of Inclusive Education Research: Identifying Concerns over Children with Disabilities”</b>.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive to some extent as it presents a background, the research design and key findings of the systematic review. There is, however, a need to revise the abstract to ensure syntactic and grammatical balance.</p> <p>There are major pitfalls regarding the subsections and structure of the manuscript, which the author(s) may consider looking into. Firstly, I would like to suggest a structural flow for the manuscript: Introduction, Conceptual Underpinning, Review of the Research into Inclusive Education, Problem Statement, Purposes/Objectives of the Study, Methodology (Incorporating Research Design, Literature Search and Screening Strategy as well as Search inclusion and exclusion criteria), Results and Discussions, Conclusion, and References.</p> <p>Secondly, the INTRODUCTION can be retained as it is in the manuscript. However, the section on <b>Theoretical Underpinning</b> is actually discussing the conceptual framework of the research and the author(s) may need to consider designating the section as <i>Conceptual Underpinning</i>. The author(s) may also need to revise the current section on Theoretical Underpinning such that the first one-third can be captured under Conceptual Underpinning, while the remaining two-third of the part is designated as a Review of Research into Inclusive Education.</p> <p>Thirdly, section 3 on <b>Significance of the Article</b> is not talking about the significance of the review, which should have encapsulated the importance of the article to certain sectors or individuals. It is, therefore, being suggested that the author(s) may need to consider changing this section to a <i>Problem Statement</i>.</p> <p>Fourthly and lastly, the author(s) may need to revise the section on <b>Research Design</b> such that it is presented as a <i>Methodology</i> section with subsections delineating <i>research design, Literature Search and Screening Strategy</i> as well as <i>Literature Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</i>. This is in view of the fact that the article is a Systematic Literature Review, which analytically synthesizes extant research findings.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct to some extent.</p> <p>The references are recent and sufficient.</p>	

## Review Form 1.7

5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 7. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Adeyinka Olumuyiwa Osunwusi
Department, University & Country	National Open University of Nigeria, Nigeria