

**Paper: “Enhancing PhD Education: Research Collaboration and Assistantship Insights from Columbia Teachers College and Georgian Universities”**

**Submitted: 19 March 2025**

**Accepted: 16 April 2025**

**Published: 30 April 2025**

Corresponding Author: Irma Machitidze

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n10p163

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Umar Bala  
Federal College Of Education, Katsina, Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Pius Okechukwu Chukwu  
University of Nigeria, Nsukka

Reviewer 3: Genute Gedviliene  
Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

To the best of my knowledge, there are no observed grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in the article.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The study methods are clearly explained.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body of the paper is clear, though not well formatted.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusion is accurate and supported by the content.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The list of the references is comprehensive but most of the sources cited are obsolete.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

The authors should revisit the cited sources and replace the obsolete sources with current ones. Current sources are within 10 years.

-----

-----

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Yes, the title is clear and adequate for the manuscript's content.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract clearly stated the objectives, methodology, and results.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

The grammatical structure and spelling in this manuscript are good enough.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methods are explained clearly.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body of this manuscript is cleared and does not contain errors.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusion of this manuscript is accurate and supported by the content.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The references are comprehensive and appropriate. only date was not included in the in-text citation of "Simmons, N.; Korte, R., & Nelson, T.). " in page two.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, no revision needed

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

-----

-----  
Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----  
**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The name is very broad. I would suggest that the authors shorten and conceptualise the title

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

In the abstract, the object and methods should be more pronounced and clearly articulated. The results are presented, but there is also a lack of coherence.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

The English is clear, but spelling mistakes should be checked.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methodology is presented in detail. Methods are explained and described.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The text of the article is clear, but the language needs to be checked.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Conclusions should be more structured and respond to the parameters of the study (aim, objectives, research questions) Since the parameters are not clear enough, the conclusions are too coherent. I recommend that the conclusions be adjusted.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The list of references should be submitted in accordance with APA requirements.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

The article should be reviewed and corrections made. I recommend that the parameters of the study be more clearly highlighted, so that the article is more structured and clearer.

-----