

Manuscript: **“Work Satisfaction and Affective Commitment Among State Prison Officers”**

**Submitted: 22 February 2021**

**Accepted: 02 April 2021**

**Published: 30 April 2021**

Corresponding Author: Muhammad Hasmi Abu Hassan Asaari

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n13p78

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Biliamin Adekunle Adeyeye, Tai Solarin University of Education, Nigeria

**Reviewer 2:** Jelena Zascerinska, University of Latvia, Latvia

**Reviewer 3:** Kiluba L. Nkulu, University of Kentucky, USA

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The title of the paper is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The abstract was clearly presented, objects, methods, and result resented but can be made more robust if reworked

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

*(Please insert your comments)*

There are numbers of language and grammatical problems with the article that needs to be worked on as suggested. A language editor would be of help in this regard to make the paper an outstanding one.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The study methods are quite okay and clearly explained.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Some aspect in the body of the paper seems a bit incoherent and needs to be reworked

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion is supported by the content but it can be made more precise than it is now for a better and apt submission

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

References are okay and appropriate

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.**

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

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

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

Please work around some few language issues and review the body of the paper its such a worthy effort. Cheers

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The title is clear and well-formulated, it is adequate to the content of the article

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

*(Please insert your comments)*

No any grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The study METHODS are explained clearly

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

However, the list of references has to be adjusted as not each in-text citation is included in the list of references and vice versa.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

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

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

Thanks to the author(s) for revealing an interesting topic! Not so much work is done in this field of research.

The paper is interesting, well-written and well-structured.

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Very clear and adequate.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

No doubt about the clarity of the abstract.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

*(Please insert your comments)*

Yes, there are but minimal errors.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Yes.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Very clear but with minor errors.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Yes.



**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.  
(Please insert your comments)

Yes.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

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

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

An excellent piece and well presented. One additional round of proofreading will help to correct minor grammatical errors.