



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Thriving Beyond Barriers: A Case Study on Workplace Dynamics of a Person with High-Functioning Autism
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 topic of this paper is very important and timely. Studying the workplace dynamics of individuals with high-functioning autism, especially in the Philippine context, fills a clear gap in the existing literature. The use of a qualitative case study design is appropriate to capture the deep, lived experiences of the participant.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Title, Abstract, and Keywords You spent almost half of the abstract talking about what future studies should do (regression analysis, EFA, mediators). This is a big mistake for a qualitative case study abstract. The abstract must report your findings, your methodology, and your conclusions. Please cut down the long text about future quantitative frameworks and replace it with more specific insights from Christian's case. Keywords: "Thriving beyond barriers" is too phrase-like. I suggest using more standard indexing terms like "Neurodiversity," "Workplace inclusion," or "Employment barriers."



Introduction

The exact phrase "high-functioning autism in the workplace" is repeated at the start of almost every paragraph. It makes the reading very monotonous. Please vary your vocabulary (e.g., use "neurodivergent employees," "individuals on the spectrum in professional settings"). The transition from global contexts (UK, US, Iran) to the Philippines is okay, but it lacks a critical synthesis. Why do these differences matter? Is it a matter of policy, culture, or economic development? Connect these dots instead of just listing facts from different countries.

Methodology

To make the paper look more professional, please include a simple table summarizing your participants. It is much easier for the reader to grasp than reading a wall of text. You mentioned "observational notes" in section 2.3, but in the Results section, we rarely see how these observations validated the verbal claims. Did you observe Christian during a noisy event? Please clarify how the observational data was actually coded and integrated.

Results

This is the weakest part of the paper. You are writing like a novelist or a diary writer, not a qualitative researcher. Look at these lines:

"Listening closely to Christian's words, I felt both his determination and the subtle challenge..."

"As I reflected on the Dean's observation, I felt a quiet awareness of how fragile focus can become..."

"As I listened carefully to the narratives in this study, I began to realize..."

You must remain objective. Do not tell the reader what you "felt" or how you "quietly realized" things. Focus on analyzing the data. Instead of "I felt a quiet awareness of how fragile focus can become," write something like: "The Dean's observation highlights the vulnerability of the participant's focus when subjected to unpredictable environmental shifts." Clean out all emotional prose from sections 3.1 to 3.10. The format of your data tags is messy. Sometimes it is [Page1 Line5] Christian, sometimes [Page 1, Lines 15-17], and sometimes [Page 2 L70-74]. Please standardize this. For example, use (Christian, Personal Interview, p. 1) or just a clean code system.

Discussion

You wrote that your findings oppose Heinze et al. (2025) because Heinze says barriers can be reduced with structural support. But in your own results (Theme 3.5, 3.9), you showed that structured routines and clear instructions helped Christian work productively. So your findings actually support Heinze, they do not oppose them. Similarly, you state your findings contradict Nishith et al. (2025) regarding coping mechanisms. Please double-check your logic here. If Christian successfully used self-control and self-adjustment to survive at work, you are showing that individual coping is important, but you also emphasized that he needs supervisor support. It is not a direct contradiction; it is a nuance. Rewrite these paragraphs to show how your case study adds depth or contextualizes these theories, rather than just forcing a contradiction to look smart.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The conclusion is too descriptive. It just repeats the summary of results. What is the bigger takeaway? What does Christian's case tell us about the readiness of academic institutions in the Philippines to handle neurodivergent faculty? As a reviewer, I find the recommendation section very strange. You spent the whole section designing a quantitative study for someone else to do. While recommending mixed-methods is okay, the primary recommendation of a qualitative case study should be actionable practical applications. What should HR departments do? What policies should the Dean implement based on Christian's experience? Give recommendations for workplace practices first.

Citations



Lim (2024) Citation: In the text, you wrote: Lim, 2024 (Original work published 2025). How can the original work be published after the citation date? This looks like a big typo. Please check the reference list. There are some minor grammatical slips and awkward phrasings (e.g., "Sir Christian sometimes experiences difficulty when tasks are given simultaneously" — in academic papers, drop the honorific "Sir" when discussing the case subject conceptually, just use the pseudonym "Christian").

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 addresses an important and timely issue on workplace inclusion of a person with high-functioning autism. The topic has value, especially for inclusive employment practice, but the paper needs stronger methodological clarity and a more focused presentation of findings before it can be considered ready for publication.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The single-case design is appropriate, but the manuscript makes some broad claims about workplace inclusion. Since the study is based mainly on one primary participant and two informants, the authors should be careful not to overgeneralize the findings.
The methodology needs more detail on how the interviews were conducted, how long they lasted, how the data were recorded, and how themes were finalized. This is important because readers need to judge the trustworthiness of the qualitative analysis.
The Results section includes many personal reflections of the researcher, such as feelings and interpretations while listening to the participants. These parts may weaken the objectivity of the findings and should be reduced or moved to a reflexivity section.
Some themes overlap, especially noise, overstimulation, pressure, and unclear instructions. The authors should refine the themes so that each one represents a distinct finding and avoids repeating the same idea.
The Discussion needs deeper analysis. At present, it mostly states whether the findings support or contradict previous studies, but it does not clearly explain why these similarities or differences matter.
The recommendation to use regression analysis seems too far from the nature of the present study. Since this is a qualitative single-case study, the recommendation should first focus on developing clearer qualitative insights or a validated framework before moving to predictive quantitative analysis.



The manuscript would benefit from a stronger theoretical or conceptual grounding. A clear framework on disability inclusion, neurodiversity, or workplace accommodation would help connect the findings to a broader scholarly discussion.

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</u> <u>1</u>	<u>Reviewer</u> <u>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.			