



REVIEWER REPORT

Manuscript Title:	Success Stories of ALS Graduates in Building Sustainable Livelihoods: A Qualitative Inquiry
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

EDITOR

<u>Comments and Recommendations</u>
Your research on ALS graduates is highly valuable, though it requires greater methodological and theoretical precision before publication. Please revise your introduction to explicitly anchor your analysis in Transformative Learning, Human Capital, and Social Capital theories. Your methodology and abstract must also be expanded to transparently report the exact participant count, the ten-year completion criteria, the use of semi-structured interviews, and the specific reflexive thematic analysis procedures employed.

REVIEWER 1

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Please explicitly state the exact timeframe criteria used for selecting your participants in the methodology section. It is vital to specify that you included graduates who completed the program within the past ten years. In the introduction, you need to name the specific theoretical frameworks that guide your inquiry. Ensure you explicitly list transformative learning theory, human capital theory, and social capital theory to anchor your analysis. Also, clarify the specific data analysis procedure in your methodology. State clearly that you used reflexive thematic analysis procedures to interpret the narratives. These additions will make your research design perfectly transparent and theoretically sound.

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
This qualitative phenomenological study addresses a crucial gap in adult education literature by exploring the post-completion pathways of ALS graduates. The methodological approach is appropriate, but the manuscript requires more specific details regarding participant selection criteria to ensure replicability. Enhancing the theoretical framing in the introduction will also elevate the academic rigor of your analysis. Implementing these adjustments will solidify the paper's contribution to sustainable livelihood frameworks.



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
☐	Accept the manuscript for publication.
☐	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
☐	The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.
☐	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

REVIEWER 2

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The abstract currently lacks the exact participant count. You must write that ten graduates shared their stories. Also, the text needs a clear mention of the interview type. State that the researchers utilized semi-structured interviews for data collection. The results part must also list the exact skills. Tell the readers about the entrepreneurial mindset. Small changes like these make the article much better.

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
I read this paper about adult student graduates. The text holds great value for community educators. You need to add exact facts to the method section so people understand the study. Please apply my advice above to improve the manuscript.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
☐	Accept the manuscript for publication.
☐	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
☐	The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.
☐	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.



SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			