

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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!

Date Manuscript Received: 10 September 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 13.09.2017
Manuscript Title: EFFECT OF WORK LIFE BALANCE ON EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION AT COLLEGE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 113.09.2017	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Could be re-formulated: EFFECT OF WORK LIFE BALANCE ON EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION: The Case of COLLEGE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST. It could promote theoretical generalizations in the paper.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Some details are missing: country name, respondents (academic) field, etc	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> In some cases article “the” is missed, use of verb in 3rd person is not always followed, too: the roles ... has (Page 4), for example.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> A paradigm (interpretive, critical, etc) could be indicated	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Figures could illustrate some of the inter-connections between work, life and job satisfaction. Also, definitions of work, life and job satisfaction could be helpful to understand such a term as work life balance, work and life demands, etc: is work a part of life or other ideas?	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Directions of further research could be indicated	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Some references are cited in the text of the paper, but they are not in the list of references. In some cases surnames of co-authors are used not in the right order in the text and in the list of references.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Thank you for the interesting paper!

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No extra comments.

