

**Paper: “The Influence of Organizational Justice on Managers’ Decision-Making:
A Critical Literature Review”**

Submitted: 22 December 2023

Accepted: 30 January 2024

Published: 29 February 2024

Corresponding Author: Khalil Anwar Hussein

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n4p21

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nicasio Njue
University of Nairobi, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Caren M.B. Angima
University of Nairobi, Kenya

Reviewer 3: Sherzad Ramadhan
Bucharest University of Economics Studies, Romania

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:	Email: Sherzad Ramadhan
University/Country: Bucharest University of Economics Studies, Romania	
Date Manuscript Received: 25.12.2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: The Influence of Organizational Justice on Managers' Decision-Making	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0115/24	
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.	4
The Influence of Organizational Justice on Managers' Decision-Making," is pertinent and significant, addressing the crucial interplay between	

organizational justice and the decision-making processes of managers. This focus aligns with the broader discourse on management and organizational behavior, making a valuable contribution to understanding the impact of justice perceptions on managerial choices.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
The grammar in the provided content appears generally sound. However, there are instances of awkward phrasing and some sentences that could benefit from greater clarity and conciseness. It is recommended to carefully review and edit the text to enhance readability and ensure that the intended meaning is conveyed effectively. Additionally, attention to maintaining a consistent writing style and tone throughout the article would contribute to overall cohesiveness.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The holistic view and synthesis of literature are clear, additional details on the specific sources reviewed, inclusion criteria, and the framework used for synthesis could enhance transparency. Providing more explicit information on the methodology will strengthen the scholarly rigor and replicability of the study.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
The results are general and better to specify more and with more arguments, the author tried to present the results in general rather than specify them, the most importantly how justice influences decision-making.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
During the review, I encountered difficulties accessing some of the cited sources. It is imperative to ensure the accuracy and accessibility of references for readers and future researchers. I recommend cross-verifying each citation, confirming the publication details, and providing accessible sources, such as DOI links or complete publication information. Additionally, adherence to the citation style specified in the journal guidelines should be consistently maintained throughout the reference list. A thorough review and verification of each reference will enhance the overall credibility and scholarly integrity of the manuscript.	

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 article provides a thorough examination of decision-making processes, organizational justice, and ethical dilemmas in management. The following comments and suggestions aim to enhance the clarity and impact of the manuscript:

Clarify Generalizability: The article would benefit from a clearer discussion on the generalizability of the results. Readers would appreciate insights into how the findings extend beyond the specific scenarios discussed and contribute to the broader field of management.

Integration of Results: To strengthen the article's impact, consider integrating the results more explicitly into the broader theoretical frameworks. Discuss how the findings align with or challenge existing theories, providing readers with a deeper understanding of the theoretical contributions.

Highlight Practical Implications: While the practical implications are mentioned, consider highlighting them more explicitly. Discuss how the insights gained from the study can be applied by practitioners and managers in real-world scenarios.

Consistency in Terminology: Ensure consistency in the usage of terminology throughout the article. This will enhance clarity and prevent any potential confusion for readers.

Provide More Context: In certain sections, especially in the introduction, provide more context to set the stage for readers who may not be deeply familiar with the specific topic. This can include a brief overview of key concepts or theories before delving into the detailed discussion.

Elaborate on Methodology: While the methodology is briefly mentioned, consider providing more details about the research design, data collection methods, and analysis techniques. This will enhance the transparency and reproducibility of the study.

Engage the Reader: Consider incorporating elements to engage the reader more actively. This could include posing thought-provoking questions, encouraging reflection, or using illustrative examples to make the content more relatable.

Conclusion Section: Strengthen the conclusion section by summarizing the key findings and reiterating their significance. Additionally, consider suggesting avenues for future research to inspire further exploration in the field.

Language and Style: Ensure a consistent and professional writing style throughout the manuscript. Pay attention to grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure to enhance overall readability.

Visual Aids: Evaluate the potential inclusion of visual aids, such as charts or graphs, to illustrate key points and enhance the overall presentation of the content.

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: 29 Dec, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 31 Dec, 2023
Manuscript Title: The Influence of Organizational Justice on Managers' Decision-Making	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---56.---15.01.2024	
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.	[4]
Title though clear is incomplete. This is a critical (desk) literature review and not an empirical study, in which case this should be reflected in the title to read for example: -	

The Influence of Organizational Justice on Managers' Decision-Making- A Critical Literature Review	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	[3]
The objects and methods have not been included in the abstract. It only has the results. However, the established relationship between the two variables (organizational justice and influence on managerial decision making) should also be clearly stated.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
Grammar needs to be checked in some parts of the manuscript to enhance understanding of the discussion.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	[4]
This could be paraphrased differently to be in line with the suggested title above as it is a desk review: - A critical review of previous <u>related studies</u> would be more desirable/appropriate.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	[4]
The results are clear but would be enhanced by including a critique of the documented reviewed literature. It is also noted that the current review is mainly based on books (and not related empirical studies as indicated in the methodology).	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	[4]
This is correct but can be enhanced in line with the other comments submitted.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	[4]
The references are comprehensive. However, there is reliance on one author(s) in some parts of the manuscript. It is desirable if more empirical reviews are added.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

As above

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: