



REVIEWER REPORT

Manuscript Title:	Teaching Learning Disabilities Without Support: Experiences of SPED Trained Teachers in Remote Communities
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

EDITOR

Comments and Recommendations

I find your qualitative case study on special education educators in unsupported environments to be methodologically rigorous and profound, though it requires greater theoretical and contextual precision before publication. Please revise your abstract to explicitly identify Caraga, Davao Oriental as the research locale and specify that the study involved eight educators. Furthermore, your summary and discussion must be expanded to clearly map the findings onto the Transactional Model of Stress and Coping specifically addressing primary and secondary appraisal while delineating the mechanisms of endurance such as peer support, prayer, and the fatigue caused by resource scarcity and isolation. In your methodology and results, please ensure you explicitly integrate these theoretical frameworks to elevate the manuscript from a descriptive narrative to a robust theoretical contribution.

REVIEWER 1

Specific Comments and Recommendations

Please enhance your abstract by explicitly stating the exact sample size to improve methodological transparency. You must clarify that eight educators participated in the in-depth interviews. Additionally, specify the exact geographic bounds of your case study directly in the summary. Ensure you mention Caraga, Davao Oriental to provide immediate contextual grounding for the international reader. In the discussion section, you need to explicitly map the educators' experiences onto Lazarus and Folkman's concepts of primary and secondary appraisal. Furthermore, list the specific mechanisms of endurance, such as peer support and prayer, directly within the abstract. Incorporating these precise details will thoroughly fortify your empirical summary and demonstrate the rigorous nature of your qualitative analysis.

General Comments and Recommendations

This qualitative single case study provides a profound and methodologically rigorous exploration of the lived realities of special education educators in unsupported environments. The application of the Transactional Model of Stress and Coping is highly appropriate, yet the paper requires a much more explicit integration of this theory into the abstract and discussion to meet the standards of the journal. Furthermore, the methodological boundaries of your case study and the precise participant demographics need clearer articulation to avoid



ambiguity. Implementing these comprehensive revisions will elevate your manuscript from a descriptive narrative to a robust theoretical contribution.

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 write the exact participant count inside the abstract. State clearly that eight educators shared their stories with the researchers. Also, tell the readers the exact location of the study. Add Caraga and Davao Oriental to the summary paragraph. Next, list the exact stress factors in the text. Write that resource scarcity and isolation cause severe educator fatigue. Finally, state that the Transactional Model of Stress frames the analysis.

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
I read the manuscript about educator experiences with student disabilities in remote schools. The topic holds massive importance for rural school administrators. The first draft lacks exact facts and numbers in the summary section. You must add specific details to make the research complete.

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.



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.			