EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES (EJES)

Paper: **"Re-imagining the Role of Postgraduate Research towards a Research-Intensive University in Namibia: A Literature Review"**

Corresponding Author: Anna Niitembu Hako

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v12no1a2

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Luka Pongracic, University of Slavonski Brod, Croatia

Reviewer 2: Mohamed Jaafari, University of Cadi Ayyad, Morocco

EJES Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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

Date Manuscript Received: 24.4.2025.	Date Review Report Submitted: 9.5.2025.
Manuscript Title: **Re-imagining the Role of Postgraduate Research towards a Research-Intensive University in Namibia**	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: **Yes**/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: **Yes**/No You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: **Yes**/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.

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2
The title does not match the content of the article. The title should state that this is a literature review.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
The abstract is more like an introduction than a summary, and is over-explained at the beginning. It should be emphasized in the abstract that it is a literature review, not a research study. I suggest removing this section because no analyses were conducted, just an overview: (c) to analyze UNAM's research policies and funding opportunities,	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Many sentences are incomprehensible, so I suggest proofreading the article before publishing it.	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
The method is not explained at all. Only some critical questions are raised. It is necessary to explain the methodology and how the documents and articles presented in this article were selected.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
The article only contains a series of references from various literature and lacks the structure of a scientific article.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
The conclusion does not discuss the literature review that was done in the article, but is presented as the conclusion of the research work. It is necessary to align the summary with what is described in the article.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Since this is a literature review, this article does not have enough literature. Much more recent research and theory needs to be studied.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The entire article should be structured as a literature review and the methodology used should be explained.