




Investigating the Impact of Special Education Policies on the Psychological Well-Being of Exceptional Students




Beatriz. Peixoto¹, Diana. Rodrigues da Silva^{2*}, Giselle. Mata³

¹ Department of Education and Training of Professors, Viana do Castelo, Portugal

² Insight - Piaget Research Center for Human and Ecological Development, Escola Higher de Education Jean Piaget, Almada, Portugal

³ Research Centre in Education (CIE-ISPA), ISPA—Instituto Universitário de Ciências Psicológicas, Sociais e da Vida, 1149-041 Lisbon, Portugal

* Corresponding author email address: DianadaSilva@ese.ipvc.pt

Editor	Reviewers
Shahrooz Nemati  Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Educational Science and Psychology, University of Tabriz, Iran Sh.Nemati@Tabrizu.ac.ir	Reviewer 1: Masoud Asadi  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling, Arak University, Arak, Iran. Email: m-asadi@araku.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Stephen C. L. Lau  Assistant Professor at Washington University in St. Louis, United States. Email: lauc@wustl.edu

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The description of the thematic analysis lacks a detailed explanation of how themes were developed. Did multiple coders review the data? Were inter-coder reliability measures taken? Clarifying this would enhance methodological rigor.

While the study discusses the effectiveness of special education policies, it does not specify whether effectiveness is measured based on students' subjective experiences alone or if objective policy evaluation metrics were used. Clarifying this distinction would add depth to the analysis.

The results mention "three primary themes: emotional and psychological impacts, the effectiveness of special education policies, and long-term student outcomes." Since thematic analysis often involves subthemes, consider structuring the findings to explicitly outline subthemes for better readability.

The discussion states, "Many teachers report insufficient training and resources, which can lead to ineffective instructional practices." This is an important point, but it lacks specific data from the study. Did participants report this issue, or is this conclusion drawn from prior research? Clarifying this distinction would improve accuracy.

The discussion mentions that "many participants expressed feelings of stigmatization and social exclusion," but it would be useful to specify whether this was more prevalent among students with certain disabilities or in specific educational settings.

The study used online platforms to recruit participants and conduct interviews. A discussion of how this may have influenced participant selection (e.g., exclusion of those with limited internet access) would be beneficial in the limitations section.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The introduction and findings use terms such as "exceptional students," "students with disabilities," and "special needs students" interchangeably. Standardizing terminology would improve consistency and clarity for readers.

The introduction states, "Emotional well-being is a complex construct influenced by factors such as social inclusion, self-perception, stress management, and teacher-student interactions." Consider adding a citation or defining emotional well-being more precisely based on existing psychological frameworks.

Some findings are presented without direct participant quotes. For example, in the section discussing stress and anxiety levels, adding more direct quotations from participants would make the findings more compelling.

The article frequently references prior studies but does not clearly differentiate findings that align with or contradict previous research. Consider explicitly stating how your findings compare to key studies.

The discussion notes that "parental advocacy played a crucial role in ensuring effective policy implementation." However, were there notable differences in the level of advocacy based on socioeconomic status or education levels of parents? Exploring this aspect could add depth.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.