



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57193

**Title: A Qualitative Case Study on the Multidimensional Challenges of Individuals with Haemophilia A in Higher Education.**

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....

Accept after minor revision.....

**Accept after major revision .....**

Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		√		
Techn. Quality			√	
Clarity			√	
Significance		√		

Reviewer's ID: JPR-212

### Detailed Reviewer's Report

The manuscript presents a qualitative multiple case study exploring the educational, physical, psychological, and social challenges faced by learners with Haemophilia A in higher education. The study is based on two purposively selected cases and uses semi-structured interviews with learners and their support systems. The findings are organised into thematic categories and highlight the role of institutional gaps and social support systems in shaping learners' experiences.

#### 2. Major Strengths

- **Relevance and Significance:** The study addresses an under-researched area, particularly in the Indian higher education context. The focus on haemophilic learners adds novelty and social relevance.
- **Holistic Approach:** The inclusion of multiple stakeholders (parents, peers, teachers) strengthens the depth and credibility of the findings.
- **Use of Thematic Analysis:** The categorisation of themes is systematic and helps in understanding multidimensional challenges clearly.
- **Strong Practical Implications:** The study highlights important gaps in institutional support and policy implementation, which has implications for inclusive education.

#### 3. Major Concerns (Require Revision)

##### a. Methodological Clarity

- The description of the **Indo-Deductive Thematic Analysis** is unclear and needs proper explanation with references.
- Sample size (only two cases) is very limited; justification needs strengthening.
- More detail is required regarding:
  - Interview protocol
  - Data saturation
  - Coding procedure

##### b. Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

- The study lacks a clearly defined **theoretical framework** (e.g., Inclusive Education theory, Social Model of Disability).
- The linkage between findings and theory is weak in the discussion section.

##### c. Language and Structure Issues

- There are frequent **grammatical errors**, repetition, and informal expressions (e.g., "why me", "I promote inclusivity").
- Sentences are often lengthy and lack clarity.
- Some sections (especially Introduction and Discussion) are overly descriptive.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

### d. Literature Review

- Although references are extensive, the **review lacks critical synthesis**.
- Recent global research could be better integrated.
- The research gap needs sharper articulation.

### e. Results Presentation

- The table of themes is useful but:
  - Formatting is inconsistent
  - Codes and categories sometimes overlap
- Some verbatim quotes need clearer integration and formatting.

### f. Ethical Considerations

- Ethical approval, consent procedures, and confidentiality measures are not clearly stated.

### 4. Minor Issues

- Typographical errors throughout the manuscript
- Inconsistent referencing style (APA formatting issues)
- Repetition in discussion and conclusion
- Some citations lack proper formatting or DOI
- Figures and tables need proper labelling and referencing in text

### 5. Section-wise Comments

#### Abstract

- Well-structured but slightly verbose
- Needs clearer mention of key findings and implications

#### Introduction

- Informative but overly general in the beginning
- Needs tighter focus on haemophilia and higher education

#### Methodology

- Requires more rigour and transparency
- Ethical considerations must be added

#### Results

- Rich in qualitative data
- Needs better organisation and concise presentation

#### Discussion

- Good attempt to relate findings with literature
- Needs deeper analytical insight rather than repetition of results

#### Conclusion

- Clear but can be more concise and impactful
- Policy recommendations should be more explicit