



Paper: “Developing Work Motivation for Lecturers at Some Public Universities in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam”

Corresponding Author: Nguyen Thi Thuy Dung

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n16p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Reynaldo Inocian
Cebu Normal University, Philippines

Reviewer 2: Haggag Mohamed Haggag
South Valley University, Egypt

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Published: 30.06.2020

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!

Date Manuscript Received: <i>11/5</i>	Date Review Report Submitted: <i>20/5</i>
Manuscript Title: <p style="text-align: center;">BUILDING WORK MOTIVATION FOR LECTURERS AT SOME PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN HO CHI MINH CITY, VIETNAM</p>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <i>0444/20</i>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper <u>Yes</u> /No You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each 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. - Using the word (<i>Building</i>) is more abstract, you may use words like (<i>enhance or develop</i>). - You do not need to add the name of the city in the title, considering that you added the country.	3
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>The Abstract is good and clearly describes the paper, still you need to add the aim and research design.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>- You are recommended to check spelling mistakes (e.g training, hoeverer..etc) and to check the tenses used in the paper.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>There is no description for the method nor the research design utilized in the research.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>-The paper does not include any questions, objectives, design or significance. -Literature review is too short to give a clear description for the paper.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>- They were not clearly stated in the paper; they need to be added.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>- Review APA style guide. - References are fewer than the literature described. - References need to be updated - Check the mistakes in spelling and referencing style using APA style guide.</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- Follow APA style guide.*
- Review grammar and spelling.*
- Follow ESJ submission guidelines.*
- Explain statistics in the light of the obtained data in the tables and add a commentary.*

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Dr. Reynaldo B. Inocian	
University/Country: Cebu Normal University/Philippines	
Date Manuscript Received: April 10, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: April 29, 2020
Manuscript Title: BUILDING WORK MOTIVATION FOR LECTURERS AT SOME PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN HO CHI MINH CITY, VIETNAM	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 44.04.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each 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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Consider revising this based on the latest revision in the methods section of the paper.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Kindly review the construction of sentences from passive to active voices, spelling, and some grammar errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Consider rewriting the methods section by specifying what specific method of quantitative research was used. Is it a descriptive method? Do not enumerate the scaling in the questionnaire. Mention the 5-point scale Likert. Is it standardized? If it is, then acknowledge the owner of this instrument. If it is crafted by the author, then, does it undergo pilot testing for validation and reliability? Then mention it here. There are verbatim interviews mentioned in the discussion. Are you using unstructured interviews? Then, mention it here. Likert mix with unstructured interviews??? Is your study using a mix method??? Then describe it here.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Do not just present a table reading of findings. Provide discussions and implications right after each of the tables presented or do it right after all the presentations of data. Provide also with a very sound support by citing some pieces of literature that affirm or negative your findings.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Consider rewriting your conclusion by directly answering your main thesis or problem.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Follow the APA 7th Edition listing of references. Consider adding more list of references based on the additional citations in the discussion and implications of the findings.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper has a potential value to dissemination and publication. I hope this will be improved based on my comments and suggestions.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 05/18/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 05/21/2020
Manuscript Title: Building Work Motivation for Lecturers at Some Public Universities in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0444/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each 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.	5
Clarity of title not a problem..	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

Object, methodology, and results are clearly presented in the abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There are errors of grammar throughout the text.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Study methods are clearly explained.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
The body is clear but contains minor editorial errors.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusion is in line with the rest of the paper.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
References are comprehensive but could be enriched.	

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):

The study is good but editorial corrections will improve and make it better.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:This is a good paper but in need of editorial improvements (grammatical and spelling errors to be corrected).