# **Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_109148
Title of the Manuscript:	ONLINE BLENDED DISTANCE LEARNING EXPERIENCES OF SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS: A PHENOMENOLOGY
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)

## **Review Form 1.7**

## **PART 1:** Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<ol> <li>The manuscript addresses a relevant and important topic in the field of education. However, to enhance its scholarly impact, it should consider strengthening its theoretical framework, providing more detailed information about the research methodology and participants, engaging in a more comprehensive discussion, and offering practical recommendations for various stakeholders in education.</li> <li>The title effectively conveys the core focus and research methodology of the study. It specifies the subject (social studies teachers), the context (online blended distance learning), and the research approach (phenomenology). This title provides a clear and concise representation of the study's subject matter and approach, which is essential for drawing the interest of potential readers. It accurately reflects the content and purpose of the research.</li> <li>The abstract provides a good overall picture of the study, but it could benefit from a bit more detail in certain areas to enhance comprehensiveness. For example, it's useful to briefly mention any limitations of the study and describe the participant selection, data collection process, or data analysis methods.</li> <li>While the manuscript follows a suitable structure with distinct subsections, there is potential for improvement in terms of content separation, clarity, and to presize a form the service security of the presentation. Also, Coping Mechanisms of Teachers and Educational Insights sections could be more clearly distinguished in terms of content. They seem to overlap in their focus on how teachers cope with challenges so it might be helpful to resure that the content in these sections is distinct and doesn't repeat points unnecessarily. Moreover, while the "Educational Insights" section provides valuable information about what teachers have learned from their experiences, it could be further developed by discussing how these insights can be applied in practice. Adding practical recommendations or implications for teachers or</li></ol>	
Minor REVISION comments	The language and English quality of the sections seem reasonably suitable for scholarly	

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)

# **Review Form 1.7**

Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	communication.  The sentence "In the US, the general public held a proactive opinion on online education learning (Asare eta I., 2021)" appears to be repeated in the manuscript, leading to redundancy. To enhance the clarity and conciseness of your writing, you may consider removing one of these instances to avoid unnecessary repetition.	
Optional/General comments		

#### PART 2:

		<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Marzieh Dehghan-Chaleshtori
Department, University & Country	University at Albany, United States

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)