



Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Investigating Science Teachers' Attitudes Toward Inclusive Practices for Students With Diverse Learning Needs: A Qualitative Approach
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers recognize the value of your manuscript and recommend revisions to further enhance its clarity, organization, and overall quality. Additionally, you are required to carefully review and verify all references in your manuscript. Please ensure that all references are existing, accurate, and can be found in Google Scholar to maintain the credibility and reliability of your study. Moreover, please ensure that only the sources cited within the text are included in the References section, and that all entries in the References section are properly cited in the manuscript. For instance, if there are 20 unique sources cited in the text, then only 20 entries should appear in the References section. Please note that multiple citations of the same source within the text are considered a single entry in the References list; therefore, the total number of references may be fewer than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
This manuscript has an important topic but in its present form I find the paper problematic not only in writing quality but research credibility itself. The paper claims a qualitative phenomenological/IPA study, yet the manuscript reads more like a proposal template or generated summary than a completed and auditable research report. In the abstract, the study says the findings are expected to reveal which already gives impression that the work is not fully completed. In the method, the sampling, number of participants, interview procedure, ethics, analytic steps, and trustworthiness measures are not properly presented. Then in the results, themes are reported in a very generic way, but there are no actual participant voices, no thick description, and no clear analytic trail showing how codes became themes. Because of this, the reader cannot judge if the findings truly came from lived experiences or were only inferred from literature/common expectations.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The authors need to rebuild the manuscript around real qualitative evidence. If this is truly IPA or phenomenological work, the results must show direct participant quotations, participant context and a transparent explanation of how interpretation was done. At present, even the tables are too broad and descriptive, and one part even shifts into language about main



hypothesis test, statistical significance and confidence intervals which is clearly inconsistent with a qualitative phenomenological paper. This makes the manuscript look internally incoherent. Also, the paper still contains obvious placeholder/journal-template text, incomplete front matter, thesis-style acknowledgment, and unsupported or questionable references, which further weakens confidence in the rigor of the study. I encourage the author to rework the study first as a proper qualitative manuscript before resubmission - clarify participants and context, present full analytic procedure, include strong verbatim evidence for each theme, align discussion strictly with actual findings, and clean the manuscript from template/thesis remnants. Only after that can the contribution be evaluated fairly.

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>
Good day, Author. Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. First of all, I commend you for taking on this topic. Investigating the attitudes of science teachers towards inclusive education is a very relevant and timely issue, especially considering the challenges of our local educational landscape.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
1. There are instructional notes and templates left inside your manuscript which gives the impression that it was not proofread. In the Methodology section, there is a sentence that says, "If a more detailed or specific design framework is needed, such as grounded theory or ethnography that can also be incorporated". Furthermore, right after your qualitative results, there is a whole section instructing the author to write quantitative elements, such as "Authors must report the outcome of the main hypothesis test", "state the direction of the relationship and the statistical significance", and use "confidence intervals". Please delete all of these. Your paper is a qualitative phenomenological study, so these quantitative instructions have no place in your manuscript.
2. The methodology section currently just defines what qualitative research and Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) are. While your abstract mentions that your participants are from Makilala Central Elementary School, the actual Methodology chapter completely lacks the real-world details of your study. You need to explicitly discuss the following: How many science teachers were interviewed? What were their demographics and years of teaching experience? How did you conduct the in-depth interviews? What were your ethical considerations and consent procedures?
3. You claimed to use IPA but the way you presented the results looks like a very basic thematic analysis. You provided tables with summaries of themes like "Commitment to Equal Learning



Opportunities" and "Limited Instructional Resources and Materials". In a true IPA study, the reviewer and the readers expect to see deep, rich narratives and direct verbatim quotes from the participants to capture their lived experiences. You need to inject the actual voices of the teachers into the results rather than just summarizing what they said in paragraphs.

4. Your discussion chapter is mostly just repeating the findings you already laid out in the Results section. Also, your abstract explicitly states that the research is grounded in the Theory of Planned Behavior, the Tripartite Model of Attitude, and the Inclusive Pedagogy Framework. However, I did not see you connect your findings back to these frameworks in the discussion. To reach the analytical depth expected in journal, you must analyze your results using the theories you promised and contrast them with the literature you cited in your Introduction.

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.			