International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines

Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Legal protections for South African Teachers in inclusive education classrooms
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

General Comments and Recommendations
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 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 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

General Comments and Recommendations
The work provides a valuable perspective on legal protections for South African teachers within inclusive classrooms. I appreciate your focus on teacher support. The document highlights a real disconnect between assigned duties and legal safeguards. To elevate this work to journal publication standards, you must provide a deeper critical analysis of the legal texts. Please review my specific suggestions below to refine the structure and arguments.

Specific Comments and Recommendations
Title The current title is clear but lacks academic punch. Consider a revision to reflect the specific legal contradictions you present. For example, specify whether you evaluate policy or constitutional law.
Abstract The abstract sets a good stage but repeats the phrase about teacher responsibilities. You mention the critical interpretivist paradigm, but you should also state the specific results clearer. Specify which constitutional provisions you analyzed.
Introduction

International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines

The introduction excellently outlines the problem with fragmented laws. You mention Education White Paper six and SIAS, but you should explain their exact legal weight. The paragraph about undiagnosed difficulties is sudden. Smooth the transition between general laws and this specific classroom problem.
Teachers as professionals with rights in inclusive education This subsection effectively uses international scholarship. You contrast South African realities with global ideals well. Expand on how local large class sizes directly negate policy intentions.
Teacher responsibilities under the inclusive education policy You appropriately identify that teachers are the initial point of contact. You should provide a concrete example of a teacher mandate from the SIAS document to strengthen this claim.
Legal protection and teacher vulnerability in inclusive classrooms This section lists various acts like the Labour Relations Act and the Employment of Educators Act. You must explain how these acts contradict each other in a real classroom scenario.
Gaps in the literature You articulate four distinct gaps very well. The transition from gap three to gap four feels repetitive. Merge them to maintain reader engagement.
Conceptual Framework You blend substantive equality, institutional theory, and Ubuntu philosophy. Ubuntu philosophy needs a deeper connection to workplace safety. Explain how Ubuntu applies to a teacher and not just the student.
Objective of the Study The objectives are clear. Ensure that your later sections actually answer these exact objectives, especially about undiagnosed cases.
Methodology You selected a qualitative critical document analysis. You list many acts and conventions. Explain your exact criteria for document selection. Detail the step by step process you used to extract data from these laws.
Results Theme one accurately captures constitutional rights. Theme two shows the heavy burden on teachers. Theme three discusses institutional support, but you should contrast this with actual resource availability. Theme four points out legal fragmentation, which is your strongest point. Expand on this theme specifically.
Discussion Your synthesis of the results is commendable. You argue that protection is an infrastructure issue. Make a stronger link back to Ubuntu philosophy here, as it disappears in this section.
Conclusion The conclusion summarizes the main argument well. You state that protection does not weaken child rights. This is a powerful sentence. End with a broader call to action for lawmakers.
Recommendations The recommendations are very actionable. You advise the Department of Basic Education to clarify roles. Suggest a specific mechanism or format for how the Department should release this clarification.
References Check all citations for consistent formats. Some sources have retrieve dates while others do not. Standardize the URLs and digital object identifiers across the list.

International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

	Decision
	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

General Comments and Recommendations
The paper deals with an important and less discussed issue in inclusive education, particularly the position of teachers as rights-bearing professionals. However, I remain concerned that the paper makes stronger legal conclusions than what the analysis presently establishes. The argument is interesting, but the legal basis of the central claims is not yet sufficiently demonstrated.
Specific Comments and Recommendations
The paper concludes that South Africa has substantial legal protection for teachers but that these protections are fragmented and insufficiently integrated with inclusive education responsibilities. Yet much of the evidence consists of broad constitutional rights, employment legislation, and policy statements placed beside each other and then interpreted thematically. This establishes that several relevant legal and policy instruments exist, but it does not necessarily establish how these provisions legally protect a teacher in an inclusive classroom, when such protection becomes enforceable, against whom it may be enforced, or what legal consequence follows when institutional support fails. More importantly, the analysis sometimes moves from what documents say to conclusions about teacher vulnerability, shifting of responsibility, institutional failure, and professional accountability in actual practice, although no empirical evidence or jurisprudential analysis is presented to establish these effects.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

	Decision
	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.

International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines

SECOND ROUND

Decision	**Editor**	**Reviewer 1**	**Reviewer 2**
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.			