



Manuscript: “Investigating the Contributions of International Oil and Gas Firms to Local Development in Ghana: Dilemmas and Challenges”

Submitted: 22 July 2020

Accepted: 29 September 2020

Published: 31 October 2020

Corresponding Author: Remy Nyukorong

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n28p74

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kazimierz Kłosiński

John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland

Reviewer 2: Monika Bolek

University of Lodz, Poland

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: Monika Bolek	Email:
University/Country: University of Lodz	
Date Manuscript Received: 9.08.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 12.08.2020
Manuscript Title: International Oil and Gas Firms in Ghana: Their Contributions and Challenges	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 16.08.2020	
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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is clear and partially adequate to the content	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Abstract presents the issue of a paper but is lacking objects and method specification related to the rest of the paper	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> I confirm that there are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Some methods are mentioned, but they do not describe the way the interviews were made. Even if it is open interview, it should have the goals specified, the answers should be grouped and presented in a table	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
Body of a paper is proper, but the content in the method and results section should be complemented by the tools description in methods and results related directly to the research performed	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Conclusions should be related directly to the research results presented in the previous section of a paper	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The references are comprehensive and appropriate	

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):

Instead of research questions the research statements should be formulated. Research question 1 is not scientific one, the names of companies should be stated in the methods and it is not necessary to describe all these companies.

Wikipedia is not the source of scientific information (page 14), information should be taken from the reliable sources.

I would suggest a main hypothesis to be formulated, supported by statements that are specified (currently in form of research questions).

Data provided in Table 1 are limited, is it possible to add more years?

Regarding the research question 2, there are two questions by the way, and they are not the research questions, too, just information that can be provided in the introduction or methods sections of a paper. I cannot see the research results that are mentioned, but not clearly described in Methods section of a paper? They should support research questions.

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: Kazimierz Kłosiński	
University/Country: John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin; Poland	
Date Manuscript Received: 06.08. 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 10.08. 2020
Manuscript Title: INTERNATIONAL OIL AND GAS FIRMS IN GHANA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 16.08.2020. docx	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title of the text is clear – it gives back adequate the content of consideration.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract represents object, methodology and results of considerations in the</i>	

<i>very general way.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>I did not any offences.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The study methods are introduced well in the distinguished point of considerations.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>I find the whole correct with the interesting structure.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusion are introduced well in the distinguished point of considerations.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The collection counts 81 position – all are comprehensive and appropriate.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: