Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Human Resource Management 5.0 Paradigm Affecting Performance Efficiency toward Sustainable Excellence of Educational Organizations"

Dr. Ragini Gupta[1]

1. University of Jammu, India

Dear Authors,

This is a timely and well-conceived study. Applying the emerging HRM 5.0 concept to educational institutions, a setting that often lags behind corporate HR innovation, is a genuinely useful contribution, and integrating human-machine collaboration, well-being, and sustainable culture into one model reflects good systems thinking. Congratulations on a solid piece of work.

Strengths

The exploratory sequential mixed-methods design fits the research question well, with each phase clearly explained. Sampling is sound, and you've reported validity/reliability checks that many manuscripts skip. The conceptual model is theoretically grounded, and the strategic recommendations give the paper practical value beyond theory.

Suggestions for Improvement

Qualitative phase:

- Please report basic demographic/role information and interview durations for your 20 key informants; this helps readers judge the depth of your expert sample.
- The findings section presents themes without direct participant quotations. Including a few verbatim excerpts per theme would strengthen credibility and transparency.

doi.org/10.32388/P1B4CC

- Please clarify what the experts rated each question against, and consider supplementing with more conventional qualitative validation steps (expert review for clarity, pilot testing, or member-checking).

Quantitative phase:

- You state regression assumptions were met, but VIFs aren't reported. With five conceptually related predictors and a strong 70.9% explained variance, readers will want reassurance that collinearity isn't inflating this figure.
- No non-response bias check appears to have been conducted for your 350 survey participants. A standard early-vs-late respondent comparison would strengthen confidence in representativeness.

Discussion/Conclusion:

- Every citation in the discussion is used to corroborate your findings; none engage with contrasting or mixed results, or discuss how findings might vary by institution type or cultural context. A more critical engagement here would deepen the theoretical contribution.
- The Discussion and Conclusion overlap substantially (e.g., the human-machine collaboration finding and 70.9% variance figure appear near-identically in both). Sharpening the distinct purpose of each section would tighten the manuscript.

Recommendation

These are reporting and critical-depth gaps, not issues with the soundness of the design. I recommend **acceptance after minor revision**, addressing the qualitative reporting, quantitative diagnostics, and discussion points above.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.