

Paper: “Examining the Theme: A Healthy Work Place and its Role in Promoting Work Place Health”

Submitted: 31 July 2021

Accepted: 23 August 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Flourish Abumere

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n32p58](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n32p58)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nasreen Khan
SZABIST, Dubai

Reviewer 2: Abebe Ferede
Arsi University, Ethiopia

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 Nasreen Khan | |
| University/Country: SZABIST Dubai,UAE | |
| Date Manuscript Received:5/8/2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: 7/8/2021 |
| Manuscript Title: EXAMINING THE THEME: A HEALTHY WORKPLACE AND ITS ROLE IN PROMOTING WORKPLACE HEALTH | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0839/21 | |
| 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. | 4 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| <i>(Yes)</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 3 |
| <i>(Can elaborate on methods)</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| <i>(Not many)</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 3 |
| <i>(Not as such , can elaborate on it)</i> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 4 |
| <i>Satisfactory)</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| <i>(Satisfactory)</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>(Satisfactory)</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Accepted, no revision needed | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Reject | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Abebe Ferede | Email: |
| University/Country: Arsi University, Asella, Ethiopia | |
| Date Manuscript Received: August 05, 2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: August 08, 2021 |
| Manuscript Title: | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: | |
| 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>The title incorporated clear objectives and explained best in short</i> | |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| The background of the theme sufficiently summarized | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 3.5 |
| <i>There are undeniable grammatical errors in this article that need correction</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| <i>The review method is efficient</i> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| The theme presented specifically meets the objectives | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| Well explained | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 3 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| <i>Some references listed as reference, but not found in main text</i> | |
| <i>Some statements need reference/s but have not indicated</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Require few revisions focused to references and grammar errors

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Due to lack of information about revision of paper in the journal, I did not take track reviewing for this paper.