



Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Beyond the Classroom Struggles: A Case Study of a Special Education Teacher Supporting a Learner with Adaptive Skill Difficulties
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please also note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The paper has a relevant and timely focus, especially because inclusive education remains a real concern in many schools. The topic is worth studying, and the voices of the teacher, parent, co-teacher, and school principal give the study a practical value. However, I think the paper still needs strengthening in one major area: the alignment and clarity of the research design, findings, and presentation of results. At present, the paper says it is a case study, but the way the results are written sometimes appears more like a general phenomenological reflection, especially because many parts use “we felt” and “we realized,” instead of directly presenting the participant’s experience and the meaning drawn from the data. This may weaken the credibility of the analysis because the authors’ reflections sometimes become more dominant than the actual case evidence.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
My main suggestion is for the authors to revise the Results section by making the themes more focused, less repetitive, and more clearly connected to the research questions. Several themes appear to overlap, especially those on collaboration, home–school partnership, collective effort, and systemic support. These may be consolidated so the findings will become sharper and not



too many for a single case study. The authors may also reduce the repeated emotional framing such as “we felt” and instead explain what the data show, supported by the quoted statements. This will make the findings more analytical and less descriptive. Also, since the study uses only one main case, the authors should be careful in making broad conclusions about inclusive education in general. The conclusion and recommendations should be framed more cautiously as insights from one case, supported by key informants, rather than as findings that can represent many schools.

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.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The manuscript tackles a relevant topic in the field of special education. The investigation provides good local context on the struggles of educators in inclusive classrooms. However, the paper requires revisions before publication consideration. There are significant issues in the research design, data analysis, and the overall tone of the report. The authors must resolve these major concerns to meet the standard of a formal academic journal.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The authors declare the use of a Case Study design. However, the data analysis specifies the Colaizzi seven step method. Scholars utilize the Colaizzi method exclusively for Phenomenological studies, not case studies. The authors must correct this contradiction. They need to choose the appropriate analysis for a case study or change the research design to Phenomenology.
The Results section is too personal and reads like a reflection paper. The authors wrote phrases such as "we began to feel a growing concern" and "we felt a sense of uneasiness". These statements are not appropriate for a rigorous academic paper. The authors must focus the narrative on the data from the participants, not the emotional reactions of the researchers.
The manuscript presents nine themes, but many are repetitive. For example, Theme 4 discusses adaptive practices and Theme 7 discusses individualized methods. These two are practically identical in concept. Furthermore, Theme 5 discusses collaborative support, Theme 8 discusses home and school collaboration, and Theme 9 discusses collective effort. The authors must synthesize these repetitive sections into fewer, more substantial themes.
The text shifts erratically between singular and plural pronouns. In the methodology, the authors wrote "We conducted the study" but in the next paragraph, they wrote "I selected Sir Roberto". The authors should standardize the pronouns throughout the entire manuscript to maintain a professional voice.



The authors utilized in depth interviews for data collection. While the primary participant, Sir Roberto, provided substantial narrative, the quotes from the key informants are extremely brief. The co teacher, parent, and principal only provided single sentences. The authors must provide richer quotes from these informants to truly justify the triangulation of the data.

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.
	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.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			