Review of: "Applying Behaviour Change Theory to Understand PhD Supervisors' Barriers and Enablers to Supporting PhD Students with Academic and Other-Sector Careers"

Edina Molnár[1]

1 University of Debrecen

The main research question is, "What are the drivers, barriers, capabilities, opportunities, and motivations of PhD supervisors in providing career support to PhD students for academic versus other-sector careers?"

Consider truncating the title. I suggest that the authors remove "academic" and "other sector careers" and remain with "career," then proceed to narrow down the scope when introducing the research.

The topic is original and addresses the gaps in PhD supervisors' capabilities to support students' careers in and beyond the academic sector. Its relevance is based on its important contribution to the conversation on target areas to ensure PhD students receive the support needed and to equip them for onward careers in academia or other sectors.

The study applied behavioural science theory to understand the barriers and enablers to this phenomenon. The study identifies and informs gaps in supervisors' psychological capability (awareness and experience) and opportunity (e.g., prompts, time) to discuss careers. Further, the study provides data-driven recommendations of strategies to address identified barriers and enablers for career support.

Consequently, the study recommends that universities should provide careers training to supervisors, quick and easy-to-use supervisor guides on career development, regular reminders to prompt supervisors to engage in career development with students, and improve connections between university careers services and academic departments.

I recommend the use of alternative wording as opposed to "study advertisement". Additionally, since the participants' recruitment period was a bit extensive (close to 1 year), a longitudinal approach (with the same participants) would be recommended to study the behavioral characteristics and draw conclusions on observed changes. This could be mentioned under limitations/proposed as a future research direction. As it is, issues around it are alluded to but it does not come out clearly.

The qualitative approach used is very appropriate.

The conclusions and evidence address the main research questions appropriately.

However, I recommend that the authors separate the enablers from the barriers column and match strategic initiatives to

the negative and positive scoped issues, e.g., Table 3 leans heavily on barriers/challenges than enablers. Therefore, the enablers have been discussed under analysis and findings but are not sufficiently discussed/catered for in the recommendations.

The authors should also consider organising/laying out the general conclusions as per each research question.

The sources are appropriate, with 17/37 (45.9%) recent sources. Consider adjusting to at least 50% sources from 2019 to date.

The tables and figures are easy to understand, clear, and appropriately labeled.

Innovative approach	• Can be improved, especially the presentation of the discussion and methodology.

Exceptional clarity and communication	• Can be improved; check on punctuations, use of terms, and excessive use of the same phrases throughout the paper. There's also a borderline overuse of brackets ().