



**Paper: “A Logit Test of Turnover Intentions of Teachers Professionals. The Role of HRM Practices and Community Embeddedness in Public Secondary Schools in Murang’a County Kenya”**

Corresponding Author: Onesmus M. Kamau

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n25p108](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n25p108)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hanaa Ouda Khadri  
Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt

Reviewer 2: Saverio Lovergine  
INAPP, University of Rome “Tor Vergata”, Italy

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Published: 30.09.2020

# *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: 10.08.20	Date Review Report Submitted: 11.08.20
Manuscript Title: <b>A Logit Test of Turnover Intentions of Teachers Professionals: The Role of HRM Practices and Community Embeddedness in Public Secondary Schools in Murang'a County Kenya</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0875/20	
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: No	
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.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Title appears to be so long - although clear and divided in two sentences. I suggest you to use the first as a title and the second as subtitle. Use the dot instead of the colon.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>results.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments abstract is clear, and describes both methods and object</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>I suggest you to choose whether to use English or American style as some words change, and to undergo a professional proofreading service</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Method and statistical tools are well organized and explained</b>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Although the paper is really clear, conclusion are really squeezed in a very short paragraph. Could be better to widen it by adding concluding points</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>x</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The paper structure is really good, as long as the methods and the tools.  
I just suggest you to go deeper in widening the conclusion paragraph

**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: Saverio Lovergine	
University/Country: INAPP, University of Rome “Tor Vergata”	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/08/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/08/2020
<b>Manuscript Title: A Logit Test of Turnover Intentions of Teachers Professionals: The Role of HRM Practices and Community Embeddedness in Public Secondary Schools in Murang’a County Kenya</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0875/20	
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.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>results.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>There are only a few errors in punctuation and style.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Good job, well done!

There are only a few errors in punctuation and style.

The format review is required.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**