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| Compulsory **REVISION comments** | Reviewer’ s comment | Author’ s Feedback |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | **This manuscript provides a significant contribution to the scientific community by exploring the university-to-work transition in South Africa through a comprehensive bibliometric analysis. It highlights the gaps in existing literature and identifies key trends and themes relevant to higher education and employability. The findings not only underscore the necessity for more focused research in this area but also offer practical recommendations for academics and institutions, making it a valuable resource for both scholars and practitioners.** |  |
| Is the title of the article suitable?(If not please suggest an alternative title) | **The title of the article is suitable but could be made more specific. A suggestion for an alternative title could be: “ Mapping the University-to-Work Transition: A Bibliometric Analysis of Higher Education Research in South Africa.”** |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | **The abstract is comprehensive, effectively summarizing the main objectives, methods, findings, and implications of the study. However, it could benefit from including a brief statement about the significance of the identified gaps in literature and how the study addresses them. This addition would provide a clearer context for the reader regarding the relevance of the research.** |  |
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| --- | --- | --- |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | **The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate and logical. The organization facilitates a clear flow of information, guiding the reader through the introduction, methodology, findings, and implications. Each section builds upon the previous one, creating a coherent narrative.** |  |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | **The scientific correctness of this manuscript is demonstrated through its rigorous bibliometric analysis, which adheres to established research methodologies. By utilizing VOSViewer for keyword co-occurrence and visualizing publication patterns, the author effectively highlight key trends and themes within the university-to-work transition literature in South Africa. The study’s reliance on a comprehensive dataset from the SCOPUS database ensures that the findings are based on high-quality, peer-reviewed sources, lending credibility to the results. Furthermore, the manuscript thoughtfully discusses the implications of identified gaps in the literature, suggesting avenues for future research and offering practical recommendations for higher education institutions, thereby reinforcing its relevance and technical soundness in addressing contemporary challenges in the field.** |  |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.- | **The references are generally sufficient and include a mix of seminal and recent works relevant to the topic.** |  |
| **Minor REVISION comments**Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | **The language and English quality of the manuscript are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear and well-structured, though minor grammatical and stylistic improvements could be made for enhanced readability.** |  |
| Optional/General **comments** | 1. **Clarification Needed: In some sections, further clarification on the methodological framework (such as PRISMA) could enhance understanding for readers unfamiliar with the process.**
2. **Terminology Consistency: Ensure consistent use of terminology throughout the manuscript, particularly regarding key concepts like ‘ employability,’ ‘ curriculum,’ and ‘ pedagogy.’**
 |  |
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| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?**  | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |
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