Paper: **"Influence of School Climate on Teachers' Turnover Intention in Public and Private Primary Schools, Ikeja City, Lagos, Nigeria"**

Corresponding Author: Ogunji James

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Enriko Ceko
Wisdom University, Albania

Reviewer 2: Grazia Angeloni
University "G. d'Annunzio", Italy

Reviewer 3: Samuel Awoniyi
Solusi University, Zimbabwe

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024*
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.
The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Enriko cEKO	
University/Country: Canadian Institute of Technology, Tirana Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 5 July 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 7 July 2024
Manuscript Title: **Influence of School Climate on Teachers' Turnover Intention in Public and Private Primary Schools, Ikeja City, Lagos Nigeria**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0718/24	
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: You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:	

Evaluation Criteria:
Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
As a matter of the fact, the paper intends to provide information, conclusions and recommendations on the issue of teachers intention, while the tittle intends to catch up the attention of readers on the influence of teachers intention. This should be addressed carefully and clearly.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
The title of Abstract is missing. The abstract doesn't reflect the main conclusion and recommendation. At the abstract should not stated the numerical results of the study.	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There are some grammatical errors, as well as more space than one between words, but this is a minor issue, and I do believe authors can review this without any need from any external language professional.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
Methodology and methods are mot explained clearly, as well as there is no any detailed information how author collected data in terms of numbers, years, and any other specification like age of respond subjects, their field of studies and if they are contributing in their schools in their field of education (for example, someone might have finished higher education for biology, while in the school teaches geography, as usual in developing countries, and this might be one of the main reasons why teachers want to leave the school for another one where he can teach the subject he finished the school). Methods and materials is very short.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
Results are clear. There is no error, but explaining them is problematic. When it comes at regression, the main indicator is R^2 and not R. In all $R^2 > 0.5$ the hypothesis are verified, and in all R^2 , 0.5 the hypothesis are not verified. This is the only one explanation authors should provide in all of their regressions in this article. This is directly related to how authors have bilt their hypothesis. It is not clear what hypothesis has been verified with these results, since there is only 3 hypothesis without mentioning the opposite hypothesis. So, the question "Is there any relationship between school climate and teachers' turnover intention in public and private primary schools in Ikeja city of Lagos state" *doesn't tell something. Of course there is a relation, any time you ask this type of questions. But the right hypothesis might be:* H01. Is there any negative relationship between school climate and teachers' turnover intention in public and private primary schools in Ikeja city of Lagos state? Followed by H11: Is there any positive relationship between school climate and teachers' turnover intention in public and private primary schools in Ikeja city of Lagos state, *and with questionnaire and regression authors should declare the results. In case $R^2 > 0.5$ than there is a positive relation. Tis should be done for all hypothesis, so if there are three hypothesis in the paper, than, authors should state H01 and H11, H02 and H21, and H03 and H31, and for all of them $R^2 11$, $R^2 21$ and $R^2 31$*	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
There are very few conclusions and not accurate.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
The references are comprehensive and appropriate, but very few. Minimum 15 references related to the issue should be stated, not only from the local perspective. Some references about the Covid 19 pandemics period and the indication of this pandemics on education especially on teachers performance and financial benefits should be included. *If the questionaries are taken during pandemics period too, than this should be stated in the paper, and make the difference between pandemics and normal situation before and after pandemics (in case authors should make the paper a special case one). .*	

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewer Name: **Prof. Samuel Adebayo Awoniyi**	
University/Country: The University of Arusha, Tanzania	
Date Manuscript Received: **17/10/2024**	Date Review Report Submitted: **19/10/2024**
Manuscript Title: Influence of School Climate on Teachers' Turnover Intention in Public and Private Primary Schools, Ikeja City, Lagos Nigeria	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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: 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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
It should contain essentially the purpose of the study or the problem, research methodology, findings and its implication.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Minimal grammatical errors but the manuscript has a lot of spacing errors which has been corrected	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
The methodology section needs to be re-written very clearly paying attention to the scales on the questionnaire, issue of validity and reliability as well as the interpretation of factor analysis used for sample adequacy and communalities of items on the questionnaire.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
The results are clear however the use of stepwise regression analysis should have been more appropriate.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**
The findings of the study were not supported	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
List all authors cited. Check comments on manuscript for omission (s)	

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):

Check tracked comments on manuscript and harmonize your write up properly. Provide supports for your findings from the previous studies cited.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
Accept the article subject to minor corrections as indicated on the manuscript.

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.
The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Grazia Angeloni	
University/Country: "G. d'Annunzio" University- Italy Chieti	
Date Manuscript Received: Oct 17th, 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: Oct 18th, 2024
Manuscript Title: **Influence of School Climate on Teachers' Turnover Intention in Public and Private Primary Schools, Ikeja City, Lagos Nigeria**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 317	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
The scientific discussion is in line with the title of the article	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
Objects, Methods and results are clearly **explained 4**	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
The language and the ESP language is efficient and correct	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
The research method is well-developed and combines quantitative and qualitative aspects 5	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
The research results are also enriched from a quantitative perspective by tables that present comprehensive evidence	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**
The conclusions could be enriched with greater care and attention to detail	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**3**
The references can be exponded	**3**

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):

No comments except for the suggestions provided in the individual entries.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

none