

# Review of: "A Systematic Review of Factors Associated with Special Education Teacher Recruitment"

Inga Wagner

**Potential competing interests:** The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

I think that the study's basic idea and its results are very interesting and important. On the whole, I enjoyed reading the article.

Nevertheless, I'd like to mention some critical points about the article's scientific quality:

- The study's research aim should already be mentioned at the end of the introduction. This would help the reader to understand the structure of the theory part and the relevance of its paragraphs.
- My main critical point refers to the structure of the theory part. The paragraphs „Rise of Alternative Pathways“ and „The Importance of a Diverse Workforce“ and its subparts are for themselves very interesting and well readable. However, in my opinion, the context or the „bridges“ between the single paragraphs are not clear as they focus on different issues. In addition, it is not clear how they relate to the research question.
- Unfortunately, the paragraph „Conceptual Framework“ is not informative. You just mention some strategies that are used by some programs without describing them in more detail. In the theory part you could have elaborated some factors that might affect teacher recruitment (either based on theoretical considerations or on empirical evidence) and investigate their effects within your review.
- It is not clear how partnerships between stakeholders affect teacher recruitment. This should be stated and explained more explicitly.
- In the paragraph „Research Question“, there is the phrase „This allows for additional considerations to be connected that encourage specific strategies under unique circumstances“. In my opinion, in the results section you do not really fulfill this demand. At least to me, it was hardly possible to identify specific strategies for specific groups or schools in your results section.
- Some concepts were unclear to me. I'd like to list some of them below:
- „Alternative pathways“: I am from Europe – to me this expression is not clear.

- „Special education“ should be defined
- „White papers“, „white and gray literature“ – at least to me, these concepts are not clear
- Section „IOA Procedures“: Which were your quantitative and qualitative quality indicators?
- Section „Flexible and Intentional Pathways“: The term „flexibility“ or in which respects the programs offered flexibility should be described in more detail.

As a final remark: I read none of the other reviews before writing my review.