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|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript makes a timely and significant contribution to the literature on the impact of COVID-19 on graduate students, specifically focusing on China a major higher education hub. It presents robust empirical findings from a large-scale survey (n=2298) and provides valuable insights into how different demographic groups were variably affected in terms of research productivity and delayed graduation. The manuscript’s strength lies in its nuanced analysis across multiple demographic variables and its evidence-based recommendations. This research is particularly relevant to policymakers, university administrators, and scholars interested in educational resilience and crisis response in higher education. |  |
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2. Mention the statistical methods used (e.g., Chi-square, SPSS) briefly.
3. Emphasize that the findings were derived from a sample of 2,298 Chinese graduate students, which adds weight to the study.
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| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language is generally appropriate for scholarly communication. However, there are some awkward or grammatically incorrect phrases throughout the manuscript. Suggested action:A thorough language proofreading by a native or professional editor is recommended to ensure clarity and fluency, particularly in the Introduction and Discussion sections. |  |
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