

From: **Heliyon** <em@editorialmanager.com>
Date: Thu, Apr 7, 2022 at 4:26 PM
Subject: Thank you for reviewing for Heliyon
To: Muhmawangir <Muhmawangir_uin@radenfatah.ac.id>

Manuscript Number: HELIYON-D-22-02014

Management Factors Influencing Lecturers' Research Productivity in Vietnam: A Structural Equation Modeling Analysis

Dear Dr. Muh Mawangir,

Thank you for reviewing the above referenced manuscript for Heliyon, an open access journal that is part of the Cell Press family. I greatly appreciate your contribution and time, which not only assisted me in reaching my decision, but also enables the author(s) to disseminate their work at the highest possible quality. Without the dedication of reviewers like you, it would be impossible to manage an efficient peer review process and maintain the high standards necessary for a successful journal.

I hope that you will consider Heliyon as a potential journal for your own submissions in the future.

Kind regards,

Serje Schmidt, Ph.D.
Associate Editor - Business & Economics
Heliyon

More information and support

You will find guidance and support on reviewing, as well as information including details of how Elsevier recognizes reviewers, on Elsevier's Reviewer Hub: <https://www.elsevier.com/reviewers>

Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about Editorial Manager via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/7 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email

#REV_HELIYON#

To ensure this email reaches the intended recipient, please do not delete the above code

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL:

<https://www.editorialmanager.com/heliyon/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

From: **Heliyon** <em@editorialmanager.com>
Date: Thu, Apr 7, 2022 at 3:46 PM
Subject: Review for Heliyon - next steps
To: Muhmawangir <Muhmawangir_uin@radenfatah.ac.id>

Manuscript Number: ~~0000~~ HELIYON-D-22-02014
Title: Management Factors Influencing Lecturers' Research Productivity in Vietnam: A Structural Equation Modeling Analysis

Dear Dr. Muh Mawangir,

Thank you for agreeing to review the above referenced manuscript HELIYON-D-22-02014 for Heliyon.

If possible, we would appreciate receiving your review by Apr 21, 2022.

As a reminder, our review criteria are displayed below:

1. **Methods:** Are the methods described in sufficient detail to understand the approach used and are appropriate statistical tests applied?
2. **Results:** Are the results or data that support any conclusions shown directly or otherwise publicly available according to the standards of the field?
3. **Interpretation:** Are the conclusions a reasonable extension of the results?
4. **Ethics:** Does the study's design, data presentation, and citations comply with standard COPE ethical guidelines and has proper approval and consent been acquired as outlined in our Editorial Policies: <https://www.cell.com/heliyon/ethics?>

We have provided some useful links at the end of these instructions, if you would like to develop your knowledge in writing effective peer review reports. Please take a moment to look at these resources, which will guide you through the peer review process.

Please also note these important ethical guidelines all reviewers are asked to follow:

* You should treat the manuscript and your review as confidential. You must not share your

review or information about the review process with anyone without the agreement of the editors and authors involved, even after publication. This also applies to other reviewers' "comments to author" which are shared with you on decision (and vice versa).

* If you suspect plagiarism, fraud or have other ethical concerns, please raise your suspicions with the editor, providing as much detail as possible.

* Any suggestion you make that the author include citations to your (or your associates') work must be for genuine scientific reasons and not with the intention of increasing your citation counts or enhancing the visibility of your work (or those of your associates).

* Please flag any potential conflict of interest that you may have to the editor.

As a reviewer you are entitled to complimentary access to ScienceDirect and Scopus. This 30-day access can be activated in the [Rewards] section of your profile in Reviewer Hub (reviewerhub.elsevier.com) and you have six months to activate it.

Please visit the Elsevier Reviewer Hub (reviewerhub.elsevier.com) to manage all your refereeing activities for this and other Elsevier journals on Editorial Manager.

I look forward to receiving your review soon.

Thank you in advance for your contribution and time.

Kind Regards,

Heliyon

DISCLAIMER: This email is intended for the named recipient only. Please do not forward this email or share the links included here as these allow immediate access to your Editorial Manager account.

Resources for new reviewers to prepare you for writing a Peer Review report:

* We encourage you to take part in Elsevier's Certified Peer Review Course. The course will allow you to develop an in-depth knowledge of the peer review process and assist you in writing a helpful peer review report: <https://researcheracademy.elsevier.com/navigating-peer-review/certified-peer-reviewer-course>

* You can view Cell Press's initiatives designed to improve the peer review process and to help early career researchers become effective reviewers here: <https://www.cell.com/peer-review>

* You can view Heliyon's guide for reviewers here: <https://www.cell.com/heliyon/guide-for-referees>

More information and support

FAQ: How can I submit my review in Editorial Manager?

https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/28465/supporthub/publishing/

You will find guidance and support on reviewing, as well as information including details of how Elsevier recognizes reviewers, on Elsevier's Reviewer Hub: <https://www.elsevier.com/reviewers>

FAQ: How can I reset a forgotten password?

https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/28452/supporthub/publishing/

For further assistance, please visit our customer service site:

<https://service.elsevier.com/app/home/supporthub/publishing/>

Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about Editorial Manager via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/7 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email

#REV_HELIYON#

To ensure this email reaches the intended recipient, please do not delete the above code

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL:

<https://www.editorialmanager.com/heliyon/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Heliyon** <em@editorialmanager.com>

Date: Thu, Apr 7, 2022 at 3:46 PM

Subject: Review for Heliyon - next steps

To: Muhmawangir <Muhmawangir_uin@radenfatah.ac.id>

Manuscript Number: ^[OBJ] HELIYON-D-22-02014

Title: Management Factors Influencing Lecturers' Research Productivity in Vietnam: A Structural Equation Modeling Analysis

Dear Dr. Muh Mawangir,

Thank you for agreeing to review the above referenced manuscript HELIYON-D-22-02014 for Heliyon.

If possible, we would appreciate receiving your review by Apr 21, 2022.

As a reminder, our review criteria are displayed below:

1. **Methods:** Are the methods described in sufficient detail to understand the approach used and are appropriate statistical tests applied?
2. **Results:** Are the results or data that support any conclusions shown directly or otherwise publicly available according to the standards of the field?
3. **Interpretation:** Are the conclusions a reasonable extension of the results?
4. **Ethics:** Does the study's design, data presentation, and citations comply with standard COPE ethical guidelines and has proper approval and consent been acquired as outlined in our Editorial Policies: <https://www.cell.com/heliyon/ethics?>

We have provided some useful links at the end of these instructions, if you would like to develop your knowledge in writing effective peer review reports. Please take a moment to look at these resources, which will guide you through the peer review process.

Please also note these important ethical guidelines all reviewers are asked to follow:

- * You should treat the manuscript and your review as confidential. You must not share your review or information about the review process with anyone without the agreement of the editors and authors involved, even after publication. This also applies to other reviewers' "comments to author" which are shared with you on decision (and vice versa).
- * If you suspect plagiarism, fraud or have other ethical concerns, please raise your suspicions with the editor, providing as much detail as possible.
- * Any suggestion you make that the author include citations to your (or your associates') work must be for genuine scientific reasons and not with the intention of increasing your citation counts or enhancing the visibility of your work (or those of your associates).
- * Please flag any potential conflict of interest that you may have to the editor.

As a reviewer you are entitled to complimentary access to ScienceDirect and Scopus. This 30-day access can be activated in the [Rewards] section of your profile in Reviewer Hub (reviewerhub.elsevier.com) and you have six months to activate it.

Please visit the Elsevier Reviewer Hub (reviewerhub.elsevier.com) to manage all your refereeing activities for this and other Elsevier journals on Editorial Manager.

I look forward to receiving your review soon.

Thank you in advance for your contribution and time.

Kind Regards,

Heliyon

DISCLAIMER: This email is intended for the named recipient only. Please do not forward this email or share the links included here as these allow immediate access to your Editorial Manager account.

Resources for new reviewers to prepare you for writing a Peer Review report:

* We encourage you to take part in Elsevier's Certified Peer Review Course. The course will allow you to develop an in-depth knowledge of the peer review process and assist you in writing a helpful peer review report: <https://researcheracademy.elsevier.com/navigating-peer-review/certified-peer-reviewer-course>

* You can view Cell Press's initiatives designed to improve the peer review process and to help early career researchers become effective reviewers here: <https://www.cell.com/peer-review>

* You can view Heliyon's guide for reviewers here: <https://www.cell.com/heliyon/guide-for-referees>

More information and support

FAQ: How can I submit my review in Editorial Manager?

https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/28465/supporthub/publishing/

You will find guidance and support on reviewing, as well as information including details of how Elsevier recognizes reviewers, on Elsevier's Reviewer Hub: <https://www.elsevier.com/reviewers>

FAQ: How can I reset a forgotten password?

https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/28452/supporthub/publishing/

For further assistance, please visit our customer service site:

<https://service.elsevier.com/app/home/supporthub/publishing/>

Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about Editorial Manager via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/7 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email

#REV_HELIYON#

To ensure this email reaches the intended recipient, please do not delete the above code

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/heliyon/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

HELIYON-D-22-02014

Management Factors Influencing Lecturers' Research Productivity in Vietnam: A Structural Equation Modeling Analysis

Abstract: Your current abstract should be revised and please construct your abstract in a concise manner that presents readers with an instructive map to the paper and I find this helps you to organize your thoughts and to guide you as you revise the rest of your manuscript. Please compose your abstract in a logical and accurate reflection of the organizational structure of the paper. Your abstract reflects organizational structure of paper (i.e., presents problem/focus of study, research questions, participants, methodology, findings, key points from discussion of findings, and implications/recommendations)

Keywords: It will be great if you arrange them alphabetically and please include a list of key words that capture the main points of your paper. The list should at least include a term that describes your research method.

Introduction: Your current intro is not convincing. Your intro needs to convince the readers that your local study is of global importance. You can develop this rationale by formulating answers to questions such as the following: Does your study address a gap in the body of knowledge on this topic? Is the informational need of local stakeholders similar to others on a more global level? Are you addressing a significant problem, dilemma, or larger question with your study? Also, your intro should include a guiding/central research question that informs the methodological approach. Please revise it.

Literature Review: please revise the lit review and pay attention to the following:

Your review of the literature typically includes two types of sources: (a) those materials which help you to define the phenomenon in question and (b) those research materials which help you to identify what is known and not known about the phenomenon in question. It is this last part of the review of the literature from which you establish the need and focus for your study. Please remember this section is a literature "review" and not "view" so you need to show that the information presented here communicates your reflections of the collected understanding of the topic in question and not a series of reports from the individual sources you read.

Methods: Your method is not clear yet. Please revise your method section. We ask each of our authors to write their methods section in a stepwise fashion such that anyone else could use the same procedures/plan that you used. Therefore, I am suggesting that you reorganize this section to show your progression through data gathering and analysis. I am suggesting an outline below and each section should have an associated heading:

1. Please provide your rationale for selecting your current design in general and your particular design choice in particular and discuss how these choices are appropriate to answering the question under study

2. Please explain every step of data generation and collection and provide a rationale for each of your research decisions. The participants, their characteristics and their selection methods should be described in detail and justified. Provide detailed information on “5 experts,” 82 lecturers,
3. You mentioned about “in-depth interviews with 5 experts”, who you interviewed? How many times did you interview them? How long did each interview last? When did you interview them? How did you select them? How did you analyze the interview data? Please provide samples of your interview questions?
4. You mentioned “5 observations”, please provide it with detailed information about: When did you do that, How?
5. Clearly describe each step of your analysis of the data—include an example for illustration. You may present each step in terms of it from both a conceptual and operational perspective (please cite the literature that you used as a guide).
6. Please provide a statement of third-party approval that you secured in order to conduct this study (e.g., Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects) or if your local context does not require such oversight, then please indicate this and describe how you ensured ethical research practice to protect participants’ safety, privacy, and confidentiality.

Results: Please address the followings:

1. Findings should respond to the purpose of the study, and
2. Should be presented systematically, please relate to your research questions.

Discussion: Please address the following:

1. Discuss your findings in terms of what was previous known and not know about the focus of your research. Did your findings cohere and/or contrast with previous research on similar groups, locations, people, etc.?
2. Discuss the limitations of your study. These limitations can be organized around simple distinctions of the choices you made in your study regarding who, what, where, when, why, and how.
3. Discuss your position on the generalizability of your results.
4. Discuss the implications your research has for pertinent stakeholders (e.g., future research for other investigators, practice suggestions for practitioners, or policy considerations for administrators).
5. In addressing any of these elements, please make sure your discussion remains directly connected with the study you conducted.

Conclusion

Conclusion must be drawn based on research questions and purposes of your study. Please revise it.

REFERENCES: Please make sure all citations that you cited be included in »references section«