

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

Musa Saimon<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> College of Business Education

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I would like to congratulate authors for the effort they put in this interesting work. However, the following should be considered to improve the quality of the paper

1. The sampling technique (how the 6 teachers were obtained) and the recommendation should be added to the abstract section
  2. The introductory part the author should show clearly the problem that is trying to solve with this research. In other words, the reader would like to know why the author is motivated to examine PLC among Foreign language teachers. Also, there is a need to show why professional Learning community is a topic of interest in relation to the targeted teachers.
  3. There is a need to improve coherence among paragraphs and the subsection. For instance, the first paragraph in the introductory parts ends with idea of lack of the methods for PD, however, the next paragraph talks about the nature of the traditional methods of PD. In this way it is not linked to the first one and hence lack of coherence between paragraphs. Also, subsection under literature review seems to sound better coming first to the literature review section.
  4. Under the literature review the author should indicate the theoretical framework or conceptual framework through which he/she will be using to examine PLC. This will help readers to know the criteria for judging the quality of PLC
  5. The methodology section should be added with the following information
    - a. Justification for using qualitative research approach
    - b. Justification for using 6 teachers and how they were selected (sampling technique)
    - c. Identification of data analysis procedures
    - d. What type of observation was conducted
1. The paper is missing the presentation of results
  2. The discussion sounds more as description of the PLC in Israel rather interpretation of the findings

I recommend that the paper be considered for publication with major corrections. The author should submit it for second round review before being published.

