

Paper: "Career Progression of Women: Does Work-life Balance Matter?"

Submitted: 21 December 2022

Accepted: 23 June 2023 Published: 30 June 2023

Corresponding Author: Emmanuel Essandoh

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n17p106

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Nemanja Berber University of Novi Sad, Serbia

Reviewer 3: Nirmal Kumar Betchoo University of Mascareignes, Mauritius

Reviewer 4: Simon Egesa

The University of Nairobi, Kenya

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Yes, the title is clear and adequate for the paper.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, the abstract is a reflection of the paper.

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

Yes, there are a few grammatical errors.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, method is explained clearly

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

Yes, the body is explained clearly.

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

The conclusion is clear and adequate

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Ab Hamid, M. R., Sami, W., & Sidek, M. M. (2017, September Cegarra-Leiva, D., Sánchez-Vidal, M. E., & Cegarra-Navarro, J. G. (2012)

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper. [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent] 3 Please rate the METHODS of this paper. [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent] 4 Please rate the BODY of this paper. [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent] 3 Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper. [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent] 3 Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper. [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent] 4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

| phrases have also been repeated many times. |
|--|
| |
| |
| Reviewer B: Recommendation: Revisions Required |
| |

The managing yield yielden Howavan them are a favy anomatical mistalizas Come

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

The title of the paper "CAREER PROGRESSION OF WOMEN: DOES WORK LIFE BALANCE MATTER?" is clear and is adequate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract properly summaries the paper. However, it would be good if the authors could reduce it into paragraph form and not point form and the length of the abstract to be under 250 words.

The abstract lacks the theory underpinning the study thus needs to be included. A concise abstract would be better

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

Few grammatical errors and spelling to be fixed.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods are not explained clearly. It needs to be improved

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

The body is clear but contains errors that must be checked and corrected.

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

The conclusion is good because it supports the content of the study. However, the authors need to improve it

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference is well put together. There are few references that need to be rewritten properly

```
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
3
Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
2
Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
3
Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
3
Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
3
Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
2
```

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This paper has great quality, The title is a little broad. However, the end of the introduction must have the paper's objective. The in-text citation needs to follow one pattern, and I suggest you pay attention to them well.

The theories underpinning the study must come out clearly in the abstract.

| Reviewer C: |
|-----------------------------------|
| Reviewei C. |
| Recommendation: Accept Submission |
| Recommendation. Recept buomission |
| |
| |
| |

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

Please change to:

The impact of work life balance on the career progress of women in Ghana Title is clearer and better to understand.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Abstract is okay.

There is a choice between a structured and a simple abstract but overall this is acceptable.

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

Just a few:

See page 5

This regards hypotheses 2 and 3 with capital letters in the text.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The method is random sampling. This is done in Ghana. Some more explanation is needed here.

Why is random sampling chosen?

Has a reliability test been done?

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

Body is okay.

Introduction: This should be one paragraph.

The next is Problem statement.

The introduction looks long and can be paragraphed.

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

Conclusion is okay.

The hypotheses have been tested.

The results have been obtained and support the arguments.

The context is well explained.

Why not add future research perspectives?

Overall that 's good.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

I am satisfied with the references.

A reference to statistical sources could also help.

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]
```



[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]

3

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):

A good paper.

It is well drafted.

Language level is good.

Depth of the study is okay.

The title must be changed.

The scientific evaluations are accepted.

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

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

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

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

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

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

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

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

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

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

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.

```
4
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, no revision needed
Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
```

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