

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_120687
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Views and Experiences of Collaborative and Individual Research Among Ghanaian Academics: A Qualitative Research
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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript makes a significant contribution by examining the impact of collaborative versus individual research in Ghanaian higher education, offering insights into academic well-being and institutional challenges. I appreciate its empirical approach and ethical considerations. However, while it effectively explores these dynamics, further elaboration on fostering collaborative cultures and exploring gender intersectionality could enhance its relevance and broader impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Comparing Collaborative and Individual Research in Ghanaian Higher Education: Impact on Academic Well-being and Institutional Dynamics	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study, detailing the focus on collaborative and individual research in Ghanaian higher education and its impact on academic well-being and institutional dynamics. It effectively summarizes the key findings and implications, highlighting the positive and negative aspects of research collaboration among academics.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate overall, as they effectively segment the content into logical parts, such as Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its rigorous methodology, clear theoretical grounding evidenced in the literature review, and meticulous data analysis presented in the results. The technical soundness is evident in the detailed description of research methods and statistical analyses employed, ensuring validity and reliability in interpreting the findings. These factors collectively enhance the manuscript's credibility and contribute to its scientific merit in the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The references in the manuscript appear sufficient and recent, covering relevant literature that supports the study's context and findings.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. However, there are a few areas where improvements could enhance clarity and readability, such as refining sentence structures for greater coherence and ensuring consistent use of academic terminology throughout the manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, the manuscript shows promise in contributing valuable insights to the field, particularly regarding the impact of collaborative research on academic well-being in Ghanaian higher education institutions. However, attention to refining the abstract for clarity, ensuring alignment of the title with the main focus, and addressing minor language improvements could further strengthen its scholarly impact. The study's qualitative approach and the depth of participant experiences provide a robust foundation, but ensuring broader relevance beyond the Ghanaian context could enhance its appeal to an international audience interested in similar issues of collaborative research dynamics and academic well-being.	

Review Form 3

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:	M. Bharathi
Department, University & Country	Jayaprakash Narayan College of Engineering, India