

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

Lizette Drusila Flores Delgado<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad Autónoma de Chihuahua

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article is promising, so here are my comments for improvement:

1. Check your way of citing and referencing, grammar, spelling, and syntax. In different sections of your paper you have incomplete sentences and mistakes. I recommend you to proof-read it with a native speaker or with an editor.
2. State in the introduction your research questions and set the specific context of your study. Here you are talking in general about the problems of PD, but what was it that made YOU want to investigate this issue? Then, what were you trying to explore / describe / explain with your study? It is important that, from the very beginning, we as readers know your problem so that we can understand better your following chapters.
3. In your Literature review, you have these phrases: "*Teachers of EFL often feel isolated and in need of a community (Yeh 2005). Teacher study groups as a vehicle to strengthen EFL teachers' professional identity and voice. The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, 7(4), 50-73. The model of professional learning communities was initiated in the 1990's in the United States. (DuFour 2004).*" They are confusing and it is not clear the point you are trying to make by including them.
4. In the section The development of PLCs in Israel, I recommend that you provide more background: where did they start? when? in which context were they implemented? What were their aims and results?
5. I recommend you to write your Review of the literature like this: Start with a topic statement, provide evidence, and then explain it and relate it to your study; this way, it will be more analytical rather than just descriptive.
6. Methodology: It is not clear who the participants of the study are. You mention 2 PLC, but: who belonged to those PLCs? What were their characteristics and roles? What was the difference between the lead teachers and participants? What kind of teachers are they? What are their profiles? I believe that a more detailed description would help us understand better the topic. In a study like this, the profiles are important as they might be related to the types of interactions among the participants of the PLCs.
7. What were your ethical considerations regarding the study? Include this in your methodology.
8. In your results you cover important aspects of PLCs such as the development of a connection, cooperation, and the roles of the participants, but none of these points are developed in your Literature Review. I recommend that you describe them first in the LR so that later you can discuss them (remember, the discussion is where you link your findings to the current literature, you analyze it, and come up with your own conclusions).

Thus, I believe that this article is promising but that you need to make your purpose clear from the very beginning so that everything “flows” better. Also, make your Literature Review more analytical and make sure that it includes the key elements of PLC as there is plenty of literature on this area and you need it for your discussion chapter. Finally, make sure that your methodology is very clear, especially regarding who your participants are.

I hope these comments are useful so that your paper can be improved :)