Paper: **"Perception of Organizational Politics, Psychological Safety, and Work Efforts of Senior High School Teachers"**

Corresponding Author: Lebbaeus Asamani

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Samuel Maina
Kenyatta University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Hanaa Ouda Khadri
Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt

Reviewer 3: John Ohiorenoya
Benson Idahosa University, Benin City, Nigeria

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: Prof. John O. Ohiorenoya	
University/Country: Benson Idahosa University, Benin City, Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: June 29, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: June 8, 2020
Manuscript Title: Perception of organizational politics and psychological safety	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 06105/20	
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.	**5**
The content of the article adequately captures the key variables in the title	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results(Please insert your comments)	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
Author(s) may need to revise the article for grammar errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
The study methods are explained clearly	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**3**
The body of the paper is clear but contain few errors	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
Conclusions are good and supported by the content	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**2**
References are not current. Some references in the list of references are not in the body of the article and vice versa	

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): Author(s) need to review the contents by adding current literature. They should painstakingly review the referencing so that those references not captured in the body of the paper are excluded in the list of references.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: The double blind review method gives your journal a good reputation but patience is needed to ensure that authors follow most of the observations by reviewers