

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_76132
Title of the Manuscript:	Academic labour Process and 'Identity-Work' Construction in Neo-Liberal University: "Liminal Experience" of Academics in Nigeria Universities.
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title needs revision. Appears to be vague. 2. The entire article is not an empirical paper. It is only a conceptual paper. As such it does not hold weightage for analysis and discussion. 3. What is the statement of the problem? What are the objectives? Why the Universities are selected? These are not justified by the researcher. 4. There is no research methodology in this paper. 5. Liminal experience of Universities and the variables undertaken for the study in Universities (especially academic labour process) are missing in this paper. 6. What are the reforms made by Nigerian Universities that are undertaken for this study? 7. What are the academic policy reforms? How academic governance is measured? 8. What are the changes happened in academics in these Universities due to uncertainty (especially Covid 19) 9. What are the new social reforms and practices (liminality) of these universities? 10. In the "methodological approach" part, it mentions about empirical illustration is followed in the next section. This is lacking. 11. The entire paper is only a review of literature. 12. The researcher failed to link the academic labor process with identity work and liminal experience. 13. Teaching, research and community engagements are mentioned in the literature review. Are these the factors to be benchmarked? 14. Overall, the researcher couldn't bring out the quality of an empirical paper. Rather literature review of work process, self identity and liminal experience are mentioned through literature sources. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Renjith Kumar.R
Department, University & Country	University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Sultanate of Oman