



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Keeping Minds on Track: Perceptions of General Education Teachers on Attention Control Involving Learners with Difficulties in Sustaining Concentration
Type of Article:	Review 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. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference whenever available to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. 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 manuscript addresses a relevant issue in inclusive education, especially on how teachers support learners who have difficulty sustaining attention. However, the paper still needs stronger alignment between its stated focus, methodology, findings, and discussion before it can be considered ready for international publication.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The central focus of the study needs to be clarified. The title and introduction suggest “teachers’ attentional control,” but most of the findings discuss strategies used to manage learners’ attention. This difference is important because it affects the research problem, interpretation of results, and overall contribution of the paper.
The introduction presents the problem in a broad way, but the research gap is not yet clearly established. The author should explain what is still not known from previous studies and why this study is needed in the specific context of general education teachers handling learners with disabilities.



The methodology needs more detail on the participants and the context. The paper mentions eight teachers from one private school, but it does not clearly describe the learners' types of disabilities or attention-related needs. This is important because the strategies used by teachers may differ depending on the learners' conditions and classroom situation.

The results section presents many subthemes, but some appear overlapping, such as positive reinforcement and rewards, or adaptive instruction and revised instructional strategies. The author should consider grouping related subthemes into clearer major themes so the findings will be easier to follow and more analytically meaningful.

The discussion needs deeper interpretation. At present, it mostly matches the findings with previous studies, but it does not fully explain what the findings mean for inclusive education practice, teacher preparation, or classroom support. The author should move beyond agreement and disagreement with literature and provide stronger insight.

Some claims in the discussion and recommendation are not well connected to the qualitative design. For example, the suggestion about regression analysis and predictive variables seems quantitative and is not directly supported by the current qualitative findings. This part should be reframed as a future research direction, not as if it was part of the present study.

The references and in-text citations need careful checking because some citation years and names appear inconsistent. This matters because international journals require accurate and verifiable sources, especially when the discussion depends heavily on previous studies.

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>
In the Introduction, you write that the problem is the teachers' own attentional control (e.g., "a persistent problem is evident in general education teachers' attentional control", and "teachers often struggle to sustain stable attentional regulation"). But when I read the Abstract, Results, and Discussion, the study is actually about how teachers use strategies to manage the attention of the learners. Is the study about teachers having attention issues, or about students having attention issues? This is a huge contradiction. If the study is about teachers' strategies to help students, the Introduction must be completely rewritten to reflect this. In qualitative research, reflexivity is good, but this paper sounds too much like a personal diary or an autoethnography in the Results section. Phrases like "I felt a sense of appreciation", "I noticed the enthusiasm in their voices", or "I felt a strong sense of appreciation for their effort, yet I also sensed the emotional weight" are not appropriate for a standard qualitative descriptive study report. The focus must remain on the data and the participants' experiences, not the emotional state of the researcher during the analysis. In Section 3 (Results), you present 12 separate subthemes (from 3.1 to 3.12) just listed one after another without any clear grouping or major themes. But



suddenly, in Section 4 (Discussion), you group everything into three main headings (Managing Distractions, Shifting Focus, Monitoring and Revising). The Results section needs to be restructured using these three main themes as the primary headings, and then place the 12 subthemes under them as sub-headings. There are several mistakes where the year in the text does not match the reference list. For example, Franklin and Harrington is 2024 in the text but 2019 in references. Chew and Cerbin is 2024 in the text but 2020 in references. Also, there are typos like "Hatie".

Specific Comments and Recommendations

Title and Abstract

The title mentions "learners with difficulties in sustaining concentration," but the abstract and method suddenly switch to "learners with disability." Are these students officially diagnosed with a disability (like ADHD), or do they just have attention difficulties? Please be consistent with your terminology. In the Abstract, this sentence is very out of place: "I believe that regression analysis examines how managing distractions... are linked to attentional control." An abstract should report what this study found, not what you "believe" a quantitative regression analysis does. Move this idea strictly to the recommendations section.

Introduction

As mentioned in the general comment, please change the focus of your problem statement. Right now, it sounds like the general education teachers are the ones who cannot focus their minds. If you mean that the classroom environment is too demanding and teachers need complex strategies to hold student attention, state that clearly. The transition between global contexts (US, Germany, Japan) and the Philippine context is okay, but it lacks deep critical synthesis. Why do they experience this? Is it because of large class sizes? Lack of training in special education? Give more context.

Methodology

Section 2.1: You mentioned you used "qualitative descriptive design" but then you write, "I emphasized the essence of my participants' perceptions by setting aside my biases... to uncover their realities." This phrasing sounds exactly like Husserlian transcendental phenomenology (bracketing), not a simple qualitative descriptive design. If it is a descriptive study, you don't need to overemphasize phenomenological bracketing. Just say you want to present a straight, low-inference description of the data.

Section 2.2: The text says the teachers are employed in the "School Year 2025-2026". This makes the data very recent and timely, which is good. But please specify how many hours or how long the interviews lasted on average.

Section 2.3: You mentioned the guide questionnaire was validated by three experts. Who are these experts? (e.g., experts in special education, qualitative research experts?). Just add a brief phrase to give credibility.

Results

Please remove your personal feelings from the narration. Example to remove: "While listening to the participants discuss classroom routines, I felt a sense of appreciation for how carefully teachers organize..." Instead, write: "The participants emphasized that organizing classroom routines carefully helps learners stay attentive." Look at theme 3.4. You included a quote from ID16: "Sometimes, I step out of the classroom to cool down..." This is a teacher coping mechanism for their own anger/stress, not really a "behavior management technique" for the learner. Please make sure the quotes match the definition of your subthemes. The quote numbering is good (e.g., ID12Pg2L38-39). It shows an excellent audit trail.

Discussion



There is a very weirdly written sentence in the second paragraph of the discussion: "...supports Sankalaite et al., (2023), who highlighted that when learners experienced difficulty or lost interest, I observed that teachers simplified tasks..." Why is there an "I observed" inside the sentence discussing Sankalaite's paper? Did you observe it in your study, or did Sankalaite observe it? Fix this grammar syntax because it confuses the reader. The contrast paragraphs (where you show who negates or opposes your findings, like Yuliana & Sukinah, or Gkintoni et al.) are very interesting! This shows good critical thinking. But you need to explain why your findings are different from theirs. Don't just say "my finding opposes X." Tell us why it opposes X in your specific context (e.g., maybe because private school setup has fewer students than public ones?).

Conclusion and Recommendation

The conclusion is a bit too long and just repeats the results. Try to make it more punchy. What is the biggest takeaway lesson from your study? The recommendation section reads like you are trying to write a proposal for your next quantitative thesis. Instead of just recommending specific statistical tools (EFA, regression analysis) for future researchers, you should also give practical recommendations based on your actual qualitative data. What should school principals do? What training do these general education teachers need right now based on the 12 subthemes you discovered?

References

Please carefully check all years and spellings.

"Hatie, J., & Clarke, S. (2024)" in reference list has "Clarke" with an "e", but in text it is written as "Hatie and Clark".

Check Chew and Cerbin (2020) in the reference list versus (2024) used in your text body.

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.			