

Paper: “Generational Cohort and Work-Life Balance Policies Preference Among University Senior Teaching Staff in Ghana: Does Gender Matter?”

Submitted: 05 November 2021

Accepted: 01 March 2022

Published: 31 March 2022

Corresponding Author: Nicodemus Osei Owusu

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n10p79](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n10p79)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Satish Kumar
Dire Dawa 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!

Date 09/11/2021	Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/11/2021
Manuscript Title: Generational cohort and work-life balance policies preference among university senior teaching staff in Ghana: Does Gender matter?		
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1152/21		
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No		
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No		
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 explains clearly the content and the methodology</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract is clear and rich of details (Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(It's explained clearly and appropriate to the behavior under consideration)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The body of the paper is fluid and clear</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes, well supported</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>More updated references are appreciated</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):

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: Satish Kumar Damodar	Email:
University/Country: Dire Dawa University/ Ethiopia	
Date Manuscript Received: 26/11/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/12/2021
Manuscript Title: Generational cohort and work life balance policies preference among university senior teaching staff in Ghana - Does gender matter?	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 52-11-2021	
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.	3

<i>(Require revision in title)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(To modify the abstract to a certain extent)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Tables are to be included and conclusion to be reworked as suggested)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	Yes
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: