

Manuscript: **“Developing Sports For Economic Growth And Development In Developing Countries”**

Submitted: 09 February 2021

Accepted: 20 May 2021

Published: 31 May 2021

Corresponding Author: Emmanuel Acquah-Sam

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n15p172

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kazimierz Albin Kłosiński, John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin/Poland

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Dr. N. K. Rathee, Delaware State University, USA

Reviewer 4: Saverio Lovergine, INAPP, University of Rome “Tor Vergata”

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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 Albin Kłosiński	
University/Country: John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin/Poland	
Date Manuscript Received: 11 II 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 16 II 2021
Manuscript Title: DEVELOPING AND HARNESSING THE BENEFITS OF SPORTS FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 78-02.2021.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>Yes</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Very clearly!</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>I did not perceive mistakes. The numbering of the section [the points] – according to me – it requires the simplification.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>They are introduced very well in the distinguished Figure 1 [particular valuable]</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>The structure of the text is clear, the result are clear, I did not perceive errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Yes</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The bibliography essentially and quantity sufficient. The collection counts 64 position - the Internet position 38</i>	

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):

side 2, the title of the section, there is “1.1” and should be “1.”;

side 5, line 2 from beneath, there is “2.1” and should be “2.”;

side 7, line 1 from above, there is “3.1” and should be “3.”;

line 3 from above, there is “4.1” and should be “4.”;

line 4 from above, there is “5.1” and should be “5.”;

line 5 from above, there is “6.1” and should be “6.”;

line 9, the title of the section, there is “2.1” and should be “2.”

Consideration “Theories of “the Service Economy” should start from modest “According to my present knowledge, Allan” [the theory of the economy of Jean Batist Say (1767 – 1832) tends to be called “The Service Economy”];

side 11, the title of the section, there is “3.1” and should be “3.”;

side 13, the title of the section, there is “4.1” and should be “4.”;

side 20, line 10 from beneath, the title of the section, there is “5.1” and should be “5.”;

side 25, line 21 from above, the title of the section, there is “6.1” and should be “6.”.



ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: 3/19/21	Date Review Report Submitted: 3/25/21
Manuscript Title: Developing Sports for economic growth and development in developing countries	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 78.02.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/NoX	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/NoX	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: XYes/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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)Figure 1 provides clear description.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)Use of APA style in References to tighten up spacing and some spelling issues (for example- the fourth reference has January not spelled correctly).</i>	

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): This is an interesting article.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Dr. N. K. Rathee	
University/Country: Delaware State University, USA	
Date Manuscript Received: March 19, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 03/26/2021
Manuscript Title: Developing Sports For Economic Growth And Development In Developing Countries	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0278/21	
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
The title clearly reflects the content of the paper.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

Yes, the abstract is concise and complete	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Few minor errors make no difference on the quality of the paper.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Yes.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results have been described very well.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Conclusions and the summary add to the quality of the paper.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references have been list appropriately.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	Yes
Accepted, minor revision needed	N/A
Return for major revision and resubmission	N/A
Reject	No

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Good job.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: 19/03/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 30/03/2021
Manuscript Title: DEVELOPING SPORTS FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0278/2021	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2-3
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling	3

mistakes in this article.	
<i>Review of the paper is necessary: few errors; missed commas, semicolon; some sentences too long; some figures are not well-paginate; informal writing.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>Sorry, but the study methods are not explained ... (p.5)?!?</i> “METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES Employs qualitative analytical approach to arriving at findings, conclusions, and recommendations”	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2-3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I have been tempted to reject the paper, but I think the idea is good. This paper do not utilize any qualitative analytical approach, and do not have any methodological approach (see point 4).

The research questions are analyzed and demonstrate in an approximate way, and the same goes for the relationship in figure 2.

In any case, if you build a solid (robust) empirical and theoretical model, I will review your paper.