

Paper: **“Firm Productivity and Matching Frictions in th Labor Markets: Is This an Unending Curse to Employers?”**

Submitted: 10 July 2023

Accepted: 08 November 2023

Published: 30 November 2023

Corresponding Author: David Katuta Ndolo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n31p127](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n31p127)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Itumeleng Letsolo
Africa Nazarene University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Isaac Ogundu
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Nigeria

Reviewer 3: Georgios I. Farantos
University of Peloponnese, Greece

Reviewer 4: Irina Canco
University of Pecs, Hungary

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Georgios Farantos	
University/Country: University of the Peloponnese	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/07/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/07/2023
Manuscript Title: FIRM PRODUCTIVITY AND MATCHING FRICTIONS IN THE LABOR MARKETS: IS THIS UNENDING CURSE TO EMPLOYERS?	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0749/23	
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.	5

<i>The title describes exactly the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The article contains a well-written abstract. However, the abstract could follow a clearly structured style (including Purpose – Data Source - Study design - Data Collection/Extraction Methods – Main findings – Conclusions – Keywords).</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>Very good use of grammar and spelling. A very few spelling mistakes.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Clarify the research questions in the methodology stage.</i> <i>Clarify whether you used any checklists for the study.</i> <i>Clarify the conclusions if the hypothesis is verified.</i> <i>Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the study, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed the study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>use uniform style in tables.</i> <i>conclusions should end with text, not with a table.</i> <i>Use spaces and text between tables.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The sentence "The concept of Marginal Policy-Relationship is important in the realm of policy analysis and decision-making." should be moved to another stage of the manuscript</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>References are heterogeneous</i> <i>APA style is more appropriate for formal writing.</i> <i>You must strictly follow the APA style</i> <i>Incorrect bibliographical references for web references</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

the abstract could follow a clearly structured style (including Purpose – Data Source - Study design - Data Collection/Extraction Methods – Main findings – Conclusions – Keywords).

Specify the information sources (e.g., databases, registers) used to identify studies and the date when each was last searched.

Clarify the research questions in the methodology stage.

Clarify whether you used any checklists for the study.

Clarify the conclusions if the hypothesis is verified.

Use uniform style in tables.

Conclusions should end with text, not with a table.

Use spaces and text between tables.

APA style is more appropriate for formal writing.

You must strictly follow the APA style

Incorrect bibliographical references for web references

Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

They authors must follow:

the abstract could follow a clearly structured style (including Purpose – Data Source - Study design - Data Collection/Extraction Methods – Main findings – Conclusions – Keywords).

Specify the information sources (e.g., databases, registers) used to identify studies and the date when each was last searched.

Clarify the research questions in the methodology stage.

Clarify whether they used any checklists for the study.

Clarify the conclusions if the hypothesis is verified.

Use uniform style in tables.

Conclusions should end with text, not with a table.

Use spaces and text between tables.

APA style is more appropriate for formal writing.

They must strictly follow the APA style

Incorrect bibliographical references for web references

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Professor Isaac Ogundu	
University/Country: Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rivers State, Nigeria.	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 07-08-2023
Manuscript Title: FIRM PRODUCTIVITY AND MATCHING FRICTIONS IN THE LABOR MARKETS: IS THIS UNENDING CURSE TO EMPLOYERS.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---18.---49.07.2023---	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

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.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes, I agree	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes, I agree. Abstract should not be in italics, words such as overeducation, undereducation, overqualification should be separated with hyphen; suggestion: over-education, under-education, over-qualification. This should be effected throughout the document to ease clarity and comprehension.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes, I agree. One has been stated above. However, Page 2, 2nd Paragraph, line 25: “reducing job satisfaction and this would turn” insert “in” before turn.	
Page 3, 2nd paragraph, line 9-10:“ studies such as United Kingdom”, suggestion: “Studies carried out in the United Kingdom”.	
Page 3, line 15:” economic value which may be a result” insert “<u>as</u>” before the “a result”.	
Page 3, line16: Correct the citation with Werfhoff, refer to citation style used.	
Page 4, line 16: “policy makers have accurate information on <u>which</u> to base” replace which with “what”.	
Page 6, line 4: “greater levels of education lead to better productivity and <u>salary</u> are fixed” replace salary with salaries.	
Page 12, line 2: “similar approach was used by <u>for instance</u>” delete for instance.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
No, I don’t agree. The hypothesis were tested.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
No, I don’t agree. Findings did not clearly explain the mismatching friction of the labour market in relation to the over-educated, under-education and the firms’ productivity.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
No, I don’t agree. there was no clearly stated summary in the article.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Yes, I agree

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): Recommendations which align with the stated objectives should be included in the article. Indicate source and year of Table 2: Descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics did not indicate the different groups of the study.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: The text need to be justified.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Itumeleng Letsolo	
University/Country: ANU/ Lesotho	
Date Manuscript Received: 13 th July 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 18 th July 2023
Manuscript Title: FIRM PRODUCTIVITY AND MATCHING FRICTIONS IN THE LABOR MARKETS: IS THIS UNENDING CURSE TO EMPLOYERS?	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

<i>(Title is clear and straight forward)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(The abstract is well crafted and all objects, methods and results are clearly demonstrated)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Work well done and minimal to no grammatical errors and spelling mistakes)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(The study methods are well articulated)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(The results are clearly articulated and well supported by data)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(the conclusion and summary are well crafted and they are supported by the findings in the body of the report)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Reference are comprehensive and cover different perspectives and contexts)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

None, The paper has been proof read and its of acceptable quality

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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 Manuscript Received: 01.08.2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 13.08.2023
Manuscript Title: FIRM PRODUCTIVITY AND MATCHING FRICTIONS IN THE LABOR MARKETS: IS THIS UNENDING CURSE TO EMPLOYERS?	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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: 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.	5
<i>The title is clear and adequate with the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>In abstract is missing to say something about the methods and the results of the paper.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>There are no grammatical errors.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>The methods study is a little bit confused. The authors explain in the methodology some models but it is important to explain with an concrete examples. The same problem is with some tests of SPSS. It is no clear why the authors chosen these tests from SPSS</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>The results are clear but it is very important to explain in detail the results from SPSS e.g. in table 2, what is your explanation that sometime the Skewness test is positive, why Kurtosis test is always positive</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>The conclusions are very poor. It is needed that the conclusions to bring something new derivate from your study. The authors should focus more what new brought this study</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are comprehensive but some of them are missing in text e.g Velciu, M.; Zira, E. All the references in the end of the paper have to reflect in the paper.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is recommended:

- To be more clear the results of the SPSS tests.
- The models used in methodology is needed it explain with concrete examples.
- I suggest, the conclusions revision and to put what is new in this study.
- To put all the literature at the end of the paper in the paper

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: