

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_97849
Title of the Manuscript:	From Doctoral Students to Doctoral Holders - Four Career Stories
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, it brings interesting findings obtained through the qualitative longitudinal examination of the development of the academic-work path of doctoral students from the phase of doctoral students to the phase of doctoral holders. It defines four career paths, drawing on the narratives/stories of nine doctoral students during their studies in the years 2009–2018. It skillfully presents the basic moments of the development of their study, working and private lives and priorities.</p> <p>Yes, the title is suitable.</p> <p>Yes, it is in order.</p> <p>Although the basic structure of the study is correct, a separate section devoted to conclusions is missing.</p> <p>Yes, the study is purely qualitative and appropriately complements the prevailing set of quantitative studies in this area. The stories of nine doctoral students, followed nine years apart, are processed clearly enough and allow defining the basic motivational-study-career differences and the causes of these differences.</p> <p>Yes, the basic set of suitable literary sources is presented. Perhaps more resources from 2022 and 2023 would be requested, but it is not absolutely necessary.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>		
---	--	--

Review Form 1.7

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, English quality is suitable. There are only minor formal imperfections, e.g., missing full stop at the end of the sentence (“...and younger researchers' experiences of postdoctoral uncertainty [1; 11]” (p. 2); incorrectly cited source at the end of several sentences (e.g.: “The review is directed at changes and transitions in people's life courses. The key point is what kind of meanings and interpretations people give to changes. [54.]” (p. 3); unnecessary gaps in the connection ‘he/she’ (there is presented ‘he / she’ on the p. 5); inconsistency in personification (in the 2nd paragraph of section 5.1.1, the author repeatedly uses gender-neutral personification (he/she) but in the next paragraph the author directly writes about ‘he’; a similar contradiction is also on p. 7 (“After completing the teacher training, /she sought...”); etc.</p> <p>Although the text is grammatically quite well written, the logic of some passages and sentences is sometimes ‘skeptical’ and incoherent. Some sentences should be reformulated or developed more, e.g.: “The doctoral student's circumstances form a complex whole that should be considered holistically and spatio-temporally; doctoral students, supervisors, inclusive spaces, and dialogues [24], as also argued by Cumming [30] more than a decade ago” (p. 2); and some others too.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to read this study and help the author in his/her doctoral career.</p> <p>In an effort to assist the author in the process of increasing the resulting scientific and reader attractiveness of the study, I modestly suggest the following inspirations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It is necessary to include the main aims of the study, the methods used, the expected contributions and the actual results achieved at the end of the Introduction section.• The basic question of the whole study is: Why the second set	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>of data was obtained in 2018, and the study is directed to publication only in 2023? The five-year gap since the acquisition of data detracts from the timeliness and urgency of the entire study. It would therefore be desirable to explain in the study the reasons on the basis of which the author started to develop this manuscript only now.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I believe that it would be very helpful for the study to supplement and close section 5 with a synthesizing-comparison Table that would clearly present the key starting points, starting conditions and jobs, 'milestones', decisive factors for turnover in the doctoral career, current job classification and expectations of all surveyed respondents.• It is desirable to divide the last section of the study (Discussion) into two separate sections: Discussion and Conclusion. Perhaps the Conclusion section could also present synthesized recommendations for easier handling of doctoral studies and the career of postdoctoral fellows.• Many paragraphs are internally inconsistent. They act as if they are only artificially connected topics or ideas that do not directly follow each other. There is a lack of higher authorial 'certainty and precision' in dealing with opinions in different areas, opinions of different authors and one's own ideas. In essence, the entire section of Contextual information and literature review would deserve an analytical-synthesizing harmonization, not only of the internal content of individual paragraphs, but also of the continuity of the paragraphs with each other.• The following text is inserted at the end of section 5.2.1: "The discussion should not repeat the results but provide detailed interpretation of data. This should interpret the significance of the findings of the work. Citations should be given in support of the findings. The results and discussion part can also be described as separate, if appropriate." It will need to be removed.	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

--	--	--

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:	Martina Blašková
Department, University & Country	Police Academy of the Czech Republic, Czechia