

**Paper: “Impact of the Organizational Culture on the Employee’s performance  
Zain Telecom as a Case Study, Khartoum-Sudan”**

**Submitted: 12 April 2022**

**Accepted: 28 April 2022**

**Published: 30 April 2022**

Corresponding Author: Alfateh Fegada

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n12p237](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n12p237)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Daniela Brevenikova  
University of Economics, Slovakia

Reviewer 2: Gulali Donald Indiya  
Maseno University, Kenya

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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. Gulali Donald Indiya	
University/Country: Maseno University	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: The Impact of Organizational culture on the employee's performance Zain Telecom as a case study, Khartoum-Sudan.	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: 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	

## 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>Remove the first word THE</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The Abstract grammar flow needs to be worked of to bring the face of a masters or Doctoral scholarly article</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

The work has the relevant literature needed, however it needs to be worked on to reflect the scholars level in academia

**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: Daniela Brevenikova	
University/Country: Slovakia	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/04/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/04/2022
Manuscript Title: <b>The Impact of Organizational culture on the employee's performance Zain Telecom as a case study, Khartoum-Sudan</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 04.50.22	
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>	<b>Rating Result</b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
------------------	---

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The title reflects the content of the paper.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Objects, methods and results of the research study are mentioned and properly described.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>There are numerous mistakes (capitalization, punctuation) and grammatical errors (mainly in passive verb forms) in the body text.</i></p> <p><i>Wrong capitalization occurs in proper names (names of university departments, cities, companies, e.g. Zain, rather than zain, journals in the References).</i></p> <p><i>The percentage symbol is written after the numeral, not before it. (Table 9.1.1)</i></p> <p><i>Under several tables, sources are not indicated. You can write “Own analysis based on ...” if that is the case.</i></p> <p><i>There are missing opening quotation marks in several cases.</i></p> <p><b>Wrong in-text citation references:</b> <i>I suggest to re-write in-text citation references according to the most recent edition of APA style manual (author, year); in the case of direct citation, it is author, year, page(s).</i></p> <p><i>Please, re-write the beginning of following sentence (p. 19):</i></p> <p><b>Our study is therefore, attempted to helps specialists</b> ... (For instance: Our study is therefore an attempt to help specialists...)</p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The study methods are clearly described. The author pays a great deal of attention to this aspect of the research paper.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The results are clearly presented in tables.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Main findings of the study as well as the limitations (in terms of its applicability in other countries) are properly described and presented in the table. It was a good idea to summarize the results and present them in the table.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>It is necessary to unify the way of writing names of journals (capitalization). All reference items need to be complete (e.g. Journal of Management).</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>x</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

**I recommend to cite the original source (Hofstede) and wording when referring to Hofstede's four-dimension model of cultural dimensions rather than using a secondary source. (p.5)**

**I also suggest to mention more sources (names of authors) when stating that "*many* authors consider the importance of individual factors..." (p.7, 8.1)**

**On the other hand, I appreciate the author's detailed description of the respondent sample and useful presentation of processed information in tables.**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**I recommend to cite the original source (Hofstede) and wording when referring to Hofstede's four-dimension model of cultural dimensions rather than using a secondary source. (p.5)**

**I also suggest to mention more sources (names of authors) when stating that "*many* authors consider the importance of individual factors..." (p.7)**

**On the other hand, I appreciate the author's detailed description of the respondent sample as well as a useful presentation of processed information in tables.**