

Paper: **“Looking into the Governance of a Public Service Organization in Malta”**

**Submitted: 30 July 2020**

**Accepted: 24 November 2020**

**Published: 30 November 2020**

Corresponding Author: Karen Cacciattolo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n31p19](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n31p19)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Justus M. Munyoki

University of Nairobi, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Onyeka Uche Ofili

ISM, Paris, France

# ***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 Justus M Munyoki	
University/Country: Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 1 <sup>st</sup> August 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 5 <sup>th</sup> August 2020
Manuscript Title: <b><i>Looking into the Governance of a Non-Profit Organization</i></b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---41.08.2020----1	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <span style="background-color: yellow;">Yes</span> /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: <span style="background-color: yellow;">Yes</span> /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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the</b>	<b>2</b>

<b>article.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments) Title should clearly reflect the concepts in the study, and the context. This being a case study, the organization should be named, and the country where it is located</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) Too brief, does not present findings</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) Language use is above average, and there are few editorial issues</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) Not clear what the research design is, how many participants were involved and how they participated. Analysis procedure is inadequate</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) Introduction should clearly articulate the problem and objectives. The article has no section on Literature review</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) Conclusion is very well done</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) Citations are well captured</i>	

**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):**

The document needs to be revised and possibly the topic changed to bring out clearly the concepts of the study. The Introduction should clearly stipulate the the research problem and objectives of the study. Research methodology should be enhanced, while findings should clearly focus on what the respondents provided, not the structures given, which could have been given in the introduction

A suggestion for further research should be provided

**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!***

Date Manuscript Received: 24/06/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/06/2020
Manuscript Title: Assessing the Need for Ecotourism Cluster Establishment in Georgia: Way to increase country Competitiveness	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0697/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    Yes/No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> 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>
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(A brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(objective and results are clear but not the methods)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(There are some grammatical errors and punctuations, which needs to be corrected.)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Methods should be further clarified)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(The body is clear but there are some minor errors to be corrected. The choice of colors for figures 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8,9,10,11, and 12 need to be adjusted because they are not very readable.)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The conclusion needs to be distinguished from the results. There should be a further clarification between the conclusion and results.)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(The references style and sources should be well cited)</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):**

# ***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: Onyeka Uche Ofili	
University/Country: ISM, Paris	
Date Manuscript Received: Oct. 21, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: Nov. 03, 2020
Manuscript Title: Looking into the Governance of a Public Service Organization in Malta	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0841/20	
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>4</b>
The title reflects the content of the paper	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
The abstract captures the basic essence of the research. It explains the objective of the	

research, the purpose, methodology adopted and the findings.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
There are no obvious grammatical errors except on page 3 where the author omitted “a” in the listing of the steps taken in the methodology	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
The research methodology is simple and straightforward.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
The body of the paper is properly presented.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
The conclusion is accurate and adequately supported by the research objectives and findings.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>

**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):**

This is a well presented research paper. The researcher has done a great job and took reasonable time in conducting the research, analyzing and presenting the findings. I find the outcome of this research to be very relevant to the government of Malta, individuals and organizations with interest in public sector organizations within and outside Malta, and indeed governments in other jurisdictions.

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