Review of: "Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) for English Teachers as an Effective Alternative Framework for Professional Development"

Siamack Zahedi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I appreciate the importance of the topic being studied and the authors' efforts towards generating learning that might support policy and practice. Here are some of my suggestions / comments. My hope is that they encourage and support the authors in revising their manuscript to make it even more powerful / useful.1. Dated literature - PLCs is a topic on which there is a tremendously large body of literature available, and it is not difficult to find very current credible studies that will support your arguments. Considering this, I feel like a lot of the literature you have cited is dated - a majority of the citations (while seminal) are close to a decade or more old, when you could quite easily keep a majority of the citations within the last 5 years to keep your arguments more current (while also including a few of the most seminal older cites to show how enduring the ideas being presented are).2. The intro touches upon the objectives and rationale for the study, but isn't explicit enough and clear enough about why this study is taking place and why it is significant / important especially given the ocean of literature already available on the topic.3. The lit review section might benefit from having sub headings that help the reader more easily process your synthesis of big ideas from different studies.4. Prior lit on PLCs makes claims about (a) effects of PLCs on classroom practice and student learning (b) key characteristics of effective PLCs, and (c) essential inputs / resources / supports required at the school and individual level required to be able to run effective PLCs. Would your lit review benefit from including these ideas? 5. The methodology section might benefit from more detail. To begin with, what were the research questions or aims? What and why were specific sampling strategies used? How was the interview and observation data analyzed i.e. who coded it - one or both researchers? If both, then was the inter coder agreement calculated statistically? How was consensus established? Was a code book created at the outset? Basically, what was done to minimize threats to validity and maximize reliability of findings. I would recommend references from seminal books on qual research to direct your ideas on methodology (e.g. Marshall et al or Creswell, among others)6. I don't clearly see how your conclusion "PLC is a very positive and effective alternative model to a traditional top down in-service" is supported by the methods or the data. There was no clear measure established at the outset regarding what an effective alternative would be? And the methods did no comparative study between the alternative PD and PLCs.

Overall, I do think the paper has potential and might be valuable to policymakers and practitioners in the country of the study. However, there are some major methodological problems that need to be fixed first, as outlined above. All the best!