Paper: **"What is the Relationship between the Four Dimensions of the Balanced Scorecard and Organization Performance of Ghanaian Public Universities"**

Corresponding Author: Remy Nyukorong

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nirmal Kumar Betchoo
University of Mascareignes, Mauritius

Reviewer 2: Noor Alam
Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

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)

I would prefer Balanced Scorecard in Ghanian public universities to be a better choice.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Good abstract although a bit long, could be abridged.

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

(Please insert your comments)

Not much check consistency of Balanced Scorecard in text everywhere.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Quantitative study method was applied and well framed.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

A few slight errors especially the terms like accountingianism, etc. Please check their accuracy.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

Very good discussion and cross tabulation seen.

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)

OK

> ***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):

Excellent paper. Title must be more precise. Good work done of high technical quality. Kaplan's model is used. Hopefully, is there something beyond that like an adapted scorecard for a university linked with: customer, staff performance, student expectation, university strategy, in some way a hybrid model?

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: