



**Paper: “Supervision of Graduate Studies: A Case Study of Postgraduate and Academic Staff”**

Corresponding Author: Amel Alshehry

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n16p40

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Grazia Angeloni  
University “G. d’Annunzio”, Italy

Reviewer 2: Don Martin  
Youngstown State University, USA

Published: 30.06.2020

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

|  |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| Date Manuscript Received: 5/11/20  | Date Review Report Submitted: 5/11/20 |
| Manuscript Title: SUPERVISION OF GRADUATE STUDIES  |                                       |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 83.04.2020  |                                       |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:   YeXs/No  |                                       |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:   YeXs/No |                                       |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:   YeXs/No                     |                                       |

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

| <i>Questions</i>   | <i>Rating Result</i><br>[Poor] 1-5<br>[Excellent] |
|--|---|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>   |   |
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>          | <b>4</b>  |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>   |   |
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling</b>                        | <b>2</b>  |

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <b>mistakes in this article.</b>  |          |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <b>THERE ARE MANY GRAMMATICAL ERRORS</b>  |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>                              | <b>4</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>           | <b>4</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b> | <b>4</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>                     | <b>4</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed               |          |
| Accepted, minor revision needed            | <b>4</b> |
| Return for major revision and resubmission |          |
| Reject                                     |          |

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The paper has a number of grammatical errors and there is a tendency to repeat the same word sentences. I would have a proofreader who is proficient in English to review the manuscript as you revise it. I would also add a recommendations section where you take the information that you have gathered regarding the graduate student/faculty relationship.

Here are some of the questions you may want to answer in the recommendations section.

Is there a manual or handbook where the student advisor relationship is specified and the obligations of each person ?

Is there a research manual that describes ethics and other questions that students typically have regarding how to conduct their research?

Are there mandates about the student advisor relationship such as meeting during the students first semester in order to discuss their program of study and the advisor/student relationship?

Are there informal mechanisms such as get-togethers where students and faculty can talk to each other and get to know each other in a more relaxed setting?  
Our faculty assessed in their annual evaluations regarding the student faculty advisor relationship?

Do faculty get direct feedback from the Department chairperson regarding their student advisor relationships?

I think the article makes a contribution to the literature but I also believe many of the problems stated within the context of the manuscript can be avoided with proper procedures. Basically the advisor/ student relationship is an implicit contract but the rules and obligations need to be specified. If not, there can be many misunderstandings. There are also some faculty, who in all honesty, are poor advisors while others are excellent. I have not always been convinced that every faculty needs to be an advisor since some relish the task and others see it as a major inconvenience. Being an excellent teacher does not necessarily make you a good advisor. If every faculty has to be an advisor, then it is critical that faculty be trained on how to be an effective advisor and that the rules and obligations are very specific.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Reviewer Name: Grazia Angeloni   |  |
| University/Country: Italy  |  |
| Date Manuscript Received: April 19, 2020   | Date Review Report Submitted: April 22, 2020 |
| Manuscript Title: <i>Supervision of graduate studies: a case study of postgraduate and academic staff</i>            |  |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 83.04.20  |  |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>  |  |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b> |  |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>                     |  |

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

| <b><i>Questions</i></b>  | <b><i>Rating Result</i></b><br>[Poor] 1-5<br>[Excellent] |
|--|--|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>               | <b>5</b>   |
| <b>The title is clear and coherent with the title</b>  |  |
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>                        | <b>5</b>   |
| It is coherent, as a summary, with the purpose of the study, the method used and the results |  |

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| The language is structurally correct and plain   |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>   | <b>3</b> |
| Since it is a case study qualitative methods are fine, even if they could be improved with some focus groups to be analyzed even by a quantitative methodology e.g. by text mining on chi square occurrences   |          |
| <b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| I do not understand the meaning of the final part of the discussion “ <i>This study has several limitations. Most prominently, the research focused on a single group of participants from one university department. To investigate the concepts of this study more comprehensively, future studies should engage additional participants from multiple departments and universities. This would aid in defining the factors that most highly influence the quality of graduate teaching supervision and help guide the improvement of pedagogical practices. It is important to note that the findings of the present study cannot be generalized to other graduate programs, as they may reflect the specific perspectives of graduate students and faculty in one educational program</i> ”. |          |
| It is feasible to revise it.   |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| They are coherent with the content and the purpose   |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| Please check the accuracy of the quotations and references, quoting the number and the pages of the Review (especially the last one)   |          |

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed               |          |
| Accepted, minor revision needed            | <b>X</b> |
| Return for major revision and resubmission |          |
| Reject                                     |          |

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The ones pointed out in the comments

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only**