



Academic
Language
Experts

Date: 12 July 2024

Client: Mr. Yossi Penias

Expert: Dr. Jennifer Caisely

Managing Editor: Dr. Meredith Armstrong

Structural Review Feedback

Abstract

1. We have performed a general tidy-up and suggested a couple of optional restructurings in a few places which you can either complete or let us know if you would prefer not to make this change.

Introduction

1. We have tightened up the structure and added more headings for clarity.
2. Hypothesis – it is unclear what your hypothesis is/was, but we have highlighted what seems to be the main strands. We would suggest having a go at re-formulating this in line with our suggestions and we can then edit it accordingly.

Literature review

1. We have chopped and changed the content to create an overarching structure. We have left a few comments for areas that you might like to emphasize more. This structure is quite flexible and we have made one possible suggestion, but it's a starting point for giving your literature review more shape and direction.

Findings

1. We have completely restructured this section. It was essentially two separate papers without being connected. We have therefore re-allocated much of the content (particularly interview snippets) that were previously under "shared"/paired drivers to individual drivers (e.g. your qualitative data that was previously "cultural-political" has now been split between "cultural" and "political" respectively). Otherwise, there was not much information about the individual drivers, and it wasn't really clear how your interviews (qualitative data) interacted with your survey (quantitative data). It seemed that the links which create your "shared" drivers are a key part of your conclusion. Hence, we have left a placeholder in the text where you can add a paragraph or two summing up this particular discussion.
2. In addition, throughout this chapter, you refer to all kinds of drivers: it's not 100% clear where they all come from (e.g. the survey data seems to give rise to a different list of drivers in comparison to your interview data). If you can, reflect on where these discrepancies have come from and why your pairings of drivers (e.g. "cultural-political") are the most apt ways to express this.

Discussion

1. This was already clearly structured, well done!
2. We have added individual comments, but your discussion is a little thin and would benefit from being bulked out. We suggest the following:
 - a) Some explicit mention of a few of your findings, and
 - b) Some explicit links to a selection of the critics you mention in your literature review.

Conclusion

1. Once again, this was already clearly structured and easy for the reader to follow.

General notes

1. Please don't worry about the highlighting in the references/bibliography. These are currently being worked on in a separate document so that is just for our colour-coding system for when the time comes to add them in the correct places.
2. We have inserted a table of contents. Again, please do not worry that this isn't "perfect" just yet, it's just for our own ease of navigation through the document and we will ensure that all of the numbering is correct in the final version.
3. Once the structural edits have been accepted, we will also add table/figure headings and make sure their numbering is sound throughout. There is no point in completing this stage until the structural edits are approved.
4. We have made a few linguistic edits here and there during the structural part of the edit. Please could you accept these changes in the document if you agree with these,

this will also streamline the process and make it easier for us to move through the document.

5. In the meantime, we will continue to work on the bibliography/reference formatting in a separate document.