Paper: **"Human Resources Development and Those Left Out: Contribution of Universal Policies"**

Corresponding Author: Zoe A. Karanikola

Peer review:

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Charles N. Nalyanya	Email:
University/Country: University of Nairobi, Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received:4thMay 2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Human Resources Development and Those Left Out: Contribution of Universal Policies	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0522/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**3.5**
The title appears adequate. Suggest the constructs of HRD, Left out and Universal policies be explained in the text.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results	2

Improve Abstract to cover:- focus of study; objective of the study; problem; methodology adopted; findings; contribution to the existing literature: conclusion: recommendation for further research

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2.5

Correct grammatical errors in the article. "O" should be for only first line e.g. Over…

Refer to comments manuscript.

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1

Do more on methodology e.g. Explain why Thematic analysis methodology approach; how data was collected; how you formulated the thematic codes from which you drew the themes. Indicate your research questions/ theoretical assumptions that influenced your work.

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3

Insert subtitle; **Literature review**. Then below follows: Human development context.

For clarity:- explain the constructs of HRD; Left out; Universal policies. Justify its relevance to the study. All authors cited in Text-put yr e.g. Drucker (2017).

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3

Under conclusion:- explain how the thematic analysis findings contribute to existing literature on Human resource development/universal policies; any recommendation for further research?

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2.5

Appropriately arrange your references according to the APA manual. References be numbered and in alphabetical order. Example:-

1. Attride, S. J. (2001). "Thematic Networks: an Analytic Tool for Qualitative Research." Qualitative Research Copyright, I (3), 385–405. https://doi.org/10.1177/146879410100100307
2. Beech, J. (2009). "Who is strolling through the global garden? International agencies and educational transfer." In International Handbook of Comparative Education, edited by Robert Cowen and Andreas Kazamias, 341–357. Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6403-6_22
3. Boyatzis, R. (1998). *Transforming Qualitative Information: Thematic Analysis and Code Development.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Some of the authors cited in text are not included in references e.g. Yudice(no yr) etc. Include.

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	**X**
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
-Page number your text
-To enrich your text, read more of:
(a)Braun, V, and Clarke, V. (2006). "Using thematic analysis in psychology."
Qualitative Research in Psychology,   3, 77–101.
anhttps://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
-Braun, V, and Clarke, V. (2014). Thematic analysis
(b)Human resource development journal papers
-Check comments on manuscript

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
Kindly improve as you may find necessary.

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Sufi Amin	Email:
University/Country: International Islamic University, Islamabad Pakistan	
Date Manuscript Received: 04/05/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 09/05/2020
Manuscript Title: **Human Resources Development and Those Left Out: Contribution of Universal Policies**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: **0522/20**	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
The title is clear and no need to change.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**
Abstract is a self-contained, short, and powerful statement that describes a larger work. Abstract carries a number of structural and grammatical errors. The abstract is	

most widely read section of the thesis therefore it should be free of errors and should be written in clear and correct language. Therefore, The following scheme for the abstract of the study may be adopted:

    a) A statement of your main <u>topic</u>, purpose and <u>objectives</u>

    b) A brief description of the <u>methodology</u>

    c) An overview of the most significant <u>findings</u> or arguments

    d) A summary of your <u>conclusions</u> and recommendations

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
There are some grammatical mistakes in the paper. English grammar of the paper is required to be reviewed and sentence/syntax mistakes are to be removed	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
Methodology section is weak it needs elaboration.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**4**
The body of the paper is clear.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
The conclusion of the study is accurate.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
The references are comprehensive and appropriate but researcher did not mention any reference from 2017 to 2019. It is recommended that to include some material from 2017 to 2019 in in paper.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**X**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: