

Review of: "“A totally new situation that put us into uncharted waters”: Preschool teachers negotiate their professional identity in respect to online learning during the Covid-19 lockdowns in Greece."

Patience E. Idoga

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

You are commended for your manuscript titled “A Totally New Situation that put us into Uncharted Waters”: Preschool Teachers negotiate their Professional Identity in Respect to Online Learning during the Covid-19 Lockdowns in Greece”

The paper presented a study to highlight the ways preschool teachers negotiated aspects of their professional identities during the COVID-19 pandemic. The authors presented their ideas in a good way which makes the paper readable.

However, I have the following recommendations:

1. The manuscript is generally well written and coherent with minor exceptions...e.g., the unnecessary use of bracket before the in text citations. This is unnecessary, please remove it. “(e.g. Arndt et al., 2021)”
2. Please provide all authors email addresses
3. Keywords should be alphabetically arranged
4. While this manuscript is interesting, technically, its contribution to the body of knowledge is not clearly stated; hence, limited. The authors can improve the manuscript by including the novelty of the research to the body of knowledge.
5. There are a few typographical errors in the manuscript. The authors could do well with a professional editor.
6. The statement in line 2, under the section 2.1.1 “Qualitative studies usually engage a smaller number of participants” has to be supported by reference (s).
7. The authors mentioned in section 2.1.1 that 18 individual interviews with preschool teachers was conducted. However, the authors failed to clarify if a consent statement was presented. It is important to know if an information sheet was given to the participants and if the participants accepted to participate in the research. Please elaborate on the consent to participate.
8. The table 1 is confusing. For instance, what is the difference between “years of service” and “years”? More clarification will be needed.
9. I think the authors can extend the discussion section in the manuscript to show the reasons for most of their findings and link their findings with other studies.
10. Some of the references used in the manuscript are too old. The authors should either remove them from the manuscript or replace them with recent articles. For e.g. Ref. 2(2001), 10(2005), 11(2001), 12(2007), 13(2005), 14(2004), 15(2005), 16(2004), 17(2001), 18(2004), 20(2008), 24(2007), 25(2002), 26(2006), 27(2002), 31(2007), 35(2007), 38(2008), 39(2004), 58(2004), 60(2006), 66(1998), 69(2001), 70(1997), 71(1987) etc.

