

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.	The manuscript is a well-constructed composition It covers the most basic elements of a well designed empirical research topic and captivates its audience's interests. This manuscript must be admired for its logical progression, and the details which are included in the methodology section. The author must consider consistency with formatting and very few typographical errors. A very interesting discourse.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable title.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Very comprehensive and articulated	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate and relevant subsections and structure. The philosophical underpinnings, should be placed earlier in the methodology section of the paper.	
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 author explained the concepts of trustworthiness of the qualitative information. Detailed and thick descriptions were given to support each finding. Quite an admirable research paper, that is research bounded.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Well done!	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Few typographical errors.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Rhonda Dookwah
Department, University & Country	The University of the Commonwealth Caribbean, Trinidad and Tobago, America