

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR **54429**

Date: 21/10/2025

Title: *Collaborative Leadership, Staff Empowerment, and Administrative Efficiency: A Quantitative Analysis in a Zimbabwean Private University*

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

√Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		√		
Techn. Quality		√		
Clarity			√	
Significance		√		

Reviewer Name: **Dr. Touseef Malik**

Date: 22/10/2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

This manuscript investigates how collaborative leadership and staff empowerment predict perceived administrative efficiency in a Zimbabwean private university using a cross-sectional, correlational design (N=334). Results indicate strong bivariate associations and a multiple regression model explaining around 61% of variance in efficiency, with demographics non-significant. The study addresses a clear regional evidence gap and offers actionable implications for higher-education management operating under resource constraints. Minor refinements in reporting and APA formatting would strengthen the contribution.

Recommendation: Accept after minor revision.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

STRENGTHS

- Policy-relevant focus:** Centers human-centric drivers of efficiency—collaboration and empowerment, in a constrained HEI context.
- Robust sample:** 334 valid responses with a very high return rate, supporting internal validity.
- Reliable measures and coherent analytics:** High internal consistency; appropriate use of correlations and multiple linear regression aligned to the research questions.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. **Strong effects:** Collaboration and empowerment both show substantial relationships with efficiency; the combined model explains a large share of variance.
5. **Practical value:** Recommendations for devolved decision-making, cross-functional mechanisms, and leadership development flow directly from findings.

WEAKNESSES

1. **Measurement detail:** Provide clearer sources for instruments, sample items, and additional validity evidence beyond reliability.
2. **Assumption checks:** Regression diagnostics (normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, multicollinearity) are not reported.
3. **Common method variance:** Single-source, same-time self-reports may inflate relationships; acknowledge and address.
4. **Generalizability:** Single-site private university limits external validity; outline a replication plan.
5. **Formatting and language:** Minor APA 7 inconsistencies and typographic issues in headings, tables, and figures.