



## REVIEWER REPORT

<b>Manuscript Title:</b>	Shaping Future Scientists: Exploring the Teaching Experiences of Secondary Educators in Special Science Classes
<b>Type of Article:</b>	Original Article

### FIRST ROUND

#### EDITOR

#### Comments and Recommendations

I find your qualitative inquiry into science instruction to be highly insightful, though it requires greater contextual and thematic precision before publication. Please revise your abstract to explicitly identify the Carmen District in Davao del Norte as the research locale and specify that the study involved ten secondary educators. Furthermore, your summary must be expanded to clearly delineate the adaptive strategies used such as differentiated instruction and collaborative peer support while also detailing specific challenges like limited resources and the motivational role of student curiosity.

#### REVIEWER 1

#### Specific Comments and Recommendations

Please specify the exact geographic locale of your study directly in the abstract. You need to mention Carmen District, Division of Davao del Norte to provide immediate context. In the methodology section, clarify the exact participant count. Explicitly state that ten secondary educators joined the research. Additionally, your abstract should list the specific adaptive strategies used by the participants. Ensure you list differentiated instruction, visual and hands-on materials, and collaborative peer support. These specific additions will greatly enhance the credibility of your work.

#### General Comments and Recommendations

This qualitative inquiry offers profound insights into the pedagogical adaptations required for effective science instruction. The conceptual framing is excellent, but your abstract must explicitly state the specific location and the precise participant count for immediate clarity. Furthermore, detailing the specific coping strategies in your summary will strengthen the robustness of the study. Incorporating these details will make your manuscript a more rigorous piece of scholarship.



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

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

## REVIEWER 2

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
You must insert the exact challenge themes in the abstract. State that teachers faced limited resources and diverse student abilities. Next, list the exact professional growth areas in the summary text. Add enhanced educator confidence to the paragraph. Also, tell the audience the exact motivation source for the educators. Write that student curiosity and questions inspired the teachers. Your paper will become excellent with these exact words.

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The research on special science teachers is very informative. The current draft lacks specific facts about the exact themes. People need clear details to comprehend the whole work.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

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



**SECOND ROUND**

<b><u>Decision</u></b>	<b><u>Editor</u></b>	<b><u>Reviewer 1</u></b>	<b><u>Reviewer 2</u></b>
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.			