

Paper: “The Misunderstanding of Outcome Monitoring: A Systematic Literature Review on Instrumental Leadership”

Submitted: 27 June 2022

Accepted: 05 September 2022

Published: 30 September 2022

Corresponding Author: Elia Pizzolitto

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n28p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n28p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Muhammad Hasmi Abu Hassan Asaari
Universiti Sains, Malaysia

Reviewer 2: Paul M. Lipowski
Creighton University, USA

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Clearly stated on the subject

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Well presented

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

Not much

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Method is thoroughly done on the systematic review

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

Clear presentation and well thought

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

Conclusion well presented

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

References is appropriate

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

A well done paper

Reviewer K:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, very much so.

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

There are a few and have been noted.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, very clearly.

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

Yes.

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

Yes.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes. The references need reformatting, though.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Very good paper and enjoyed reading it!
