

# Review of: "School instability in South Africa: a Systematic Review of Reflections and Experiences for a way forward"

Prakash Khanal<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Turku

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Stable school system is crucial for providing quality education and ensuring the overall development of students. Thus, this study provides valuable insights on school instability and its consequences, and also provides recommendations for the authority to further improve the safety of schools and students. However, I find some flaws in the design of this study and needs some changes.

## The title

This study by design is not a systematic review. Even though you gave it a name of 'systematic review of reflections', I would rather call it a narrative review. Systematic review follows certain protocols and guidelines whereas in narrative review there is no strict protocol to follow. However, IMRaD approach is always preferable. Hence, I would suggest you to change the title, maybe 'School instability in south Africa: a narrative review of reflections and experience for a way forward'?

## IMRaD

The content of this paper is a bit confusing. There is too much of information condensed in a paper and a reader like me gets lost navigating to the conclusion. I would suggest to formulate this paper in IMRaD (Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussion) format. You can provide conclusion in the last paragraph of Discussion or have a separate title too. This makes the paper more systematic and readers will have clear context and content.

## Abstract

You have mentioned in the abstract that this study investigates diverse factors, drawing data derived from published literature. However, you have not provided information about which literature were they, where were they published, what was the quality of the paper, and how did you extract the information from those specific papers? I would suggest you to also provide the list of literatures that you draw conclusion from, and the procedure of data (information) extraction. You can also follow this article on data extraction technique for general literature reviews or narrative reviews;  
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2057158521991949>

## Introduction

The introduction is too vague to understand. I couldn't find where exactly the introduction ended and next portion of paper

started, and couldn't find a clear aim on what this study wants to achieve. I would suggest you to be concise in this. You have explained the Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory in one paragraph, which is fine, but again failed to connect his theory with your findings as the article follows. You could have divided your findings based on Microsystem to Macrosystem, if your aim was to explain how the school instability in south Africa (or your study zone) aligns with Bronfenbrenner's theory as in fig. 1.

## Method

The study method is missing. You have mentioned in the recommendation that 'Drawing upon a range of **scholarly sources, personal experiences of authors, and recommendations provided by teachers in select KwaZulu-Natal schools**' but you haven't mentioned anywhere about the scholarly sources, the schools in KwaZulu-Natal where you interviewed (?) the teachers. And almost through the middle of the article you have mentioned the aim of the study '**This study aims to explore the potential impact of implementing Ubuntu philosophy within the school context, with a particular focus on its implications for school discipline**'. It could be better if you can mention this early on so that readers can follow on what you intend to achieve.

.....

Well, this article is enriched with substance but lacks proper methodology. Some minor changes including language check, proper referencing and abbreviations will make this paper more scientific. Best wishes to the authors.