

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_87898
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Work or Alienation? A conceptual understanding of Academic Labour Process in Neo-liberal University System</b>
Type of the Article	Review Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>General Comment</b> This article makes an interesting contribution, in terms of an analysis through the analytical tool Marxist and Critical Discourse Analysis. The title corresponds to the theoretical validation of the paper. Keywords are not displayed</p> <p><b>Introduction and Research Context</b> I recommend in this section to add more recent sources for the introduction and justification of the analysis. There are three parts that I do not find the references and I suggest inserting citation when the author make affirmations about some concepts.</p> <p><b>Quality Assurance and Academic Leadership: a Sociological Insight.</b> In this section, the paper opens the theoretical universe of study in a logic sequence</p> <p><b>Theoretical Framework</b> The theory of Sociological Insight to explain the phenomenon is correct</p> <p><b>Discussion</b> In this section, the most important ideas about the research are clarified. However, I recommend making an outline or a table that summarizes the most important ideas of the analysis (<b>Work or Alienation?</b>) for a better understanding of the reader.</p> <p><b>The conclusion</b> invites us to reflect on the topic</p> <p><b>References</b> These authors are not in the text citations: Jaros, S. (2001), "A local View on Transformations within the Academic Labour Process", Organization: 8:365 Willimott, H. (1995) "Managing the Academics: Commodification and Control in the Development of University Education in the UK", Human Relations: 48:9.</p> <p><b>Decision</b> The topic is interesting and current with the suggestion application I suggest publishing it</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Presentation</b> I recommend including keyword Some grammatical details noted about the text (comments)</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p><b>Introduction</b> I recommend in this section and in the rest of text to add more recent sources The author has uploaded his publication (review), on his personal page of the researchgate.net</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment ( <i>if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here</i> )
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Martha Silvia Torres Hidalgo
Department, University & Country	Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, México