

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_114733
Title of the Manuscript:	Unveiling the Essence of 'Doctorateness' in Ph.D. Mentorship: Navigating the Humanity Amidst Academic Pursuits in Academia.
Type of the Article	Opinion article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is with no doubt important for the scientific community as it deals with the ethical dimension of 'doctorateness' – the dimension felt to be eroding worldwide and often compromised with utilitarianism. 2. The title is suitable is suitable, I think. 3. The abstract requires revisiting for its comprehensiveness. For instance, it remains silent regarding methodology, major findings and conclusion. It is mostly dominated by the background information. 4. I think, they are appropriate enough. Nonetheless, the sections dealing with the cases, if not 'case studies', could be made more informative and varied. 5. The term 'scientifically correct' needs more clarity. The manuscript, except some fragmentary facts, lacks a sound database based on which findings and conclusion are drawn. Nevertheless, considering the very nature of the manuscript type, which is possibly an 'opinion article' or even a 'policy paper' in your publication's terms, the manuscript seems to be acceptable. 6. As to the references, they are recent enough. Nonetheless, there are places in the manuscript where further back up is required and some of such places are indicated. <p>Additional comments and suggestions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main thesis of the paper, humanizing and dehumanizing doctorateness, yet to be established well, if possible with relevant anecdotes and vignettes. It is the bedrock for the paper. • The manuscript could be further enriched if it included some more literature survey as well. • The 'reference' section to be thoroughly revisited for inconsistencies and the given format. • The manuscript, in general, emits an impression of a 'reflective text'. The author has used the terms like 'critical inquiry', 'critical reflections', 'analytical insights as a supervisor and experiences shared by my students'. However, the author could, I believe, make this manuscript more scientific provided that he/she worked out the methodology further. • The author is required to clarify whether he/she is talking about the 'cases' or 'case studies', as they carry different nuances and collocations. • A close proofreading will enrich the paper. • The conclusion would be richer provided that it included some reference back-up as well. It is further desired as the manuscript lacks a sound database and discussion. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language is, of course, good and suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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:	Netra Prasad Sharma
Department, University & Country	Tribhuvan University, Nepal