

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_87452
Title of the Manuscript:	Teachers' perceptions of Inclusive Education: Case study of the selected schools in Johannesburg East District, Gauteng Province
Type of the Article	

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.6

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The author's research area is interesting and has invested his/her effort in preparing the manuscript. However, there are serious major revisions to make in order to improve the readability and clarity of the work done.</p> <p>1. The abstract should be rewritten in a concise manner. The author should briefly summarize what have been done, and avoid meaningless sentences. In its state readers may not be interested to further read the whole paper</p> <p>2. The problem statement is not supported with evidence. Who claimed that there is little perceptions of teachers on inclusive education? The author should include references that supports the basis of the problem being addressed.</p> <p>3. The research methodology. The research should avoid wordiness when describing the research methods followed during investigation. The author should avoid describing types interviews as this is not needed by readers</p> <p>4. Table 2 should be made clear enough to be understood by readers otherwise it is confusing</p> <p>5. Results and discussion part should focus on findings presented in the work and not be lengthy</p> <p>6. Conclusion should be written in brief not details and should reflect the findings of the work done</p> <p>7. References are not well organized. It is advisable to follow a given referencing style like APA style</p>	All the necessary corrections were done as indicated
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>8. The author is advised to check the author's guidelines from the journal and reorganize the manuscript.</p> <p>9. The author should improve the language used in terms of grammar mistakes, sentence structure, and paragraphs</p> <p>10. Reduce the volume of the manuscript below 20 pages</p>	Noted and corrected
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	