



Paper: “Framing the Decision: An Experimental Study of Managerial Judgments after Leadership Training”

Submitted: 23 June 2025

Accepted: 05 September 2025

Published: 30 September 2025

Corresponding Author: Ender Mehmet Sahinkoc

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n25p160

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mary Hollingsworth
University of West Alabama, Liberty University, USA

Reviewer 2: Aymen Alqaradaghy
Komar University of Science and Technology, Iraq

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The title of the paper is clear and describe the topics.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is 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 and presents the aspects of each variable and results.

But, it needs more clarificationw in order to be easier for the readers, especially in the section of results and how the researcher formulated the study.

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

The body of the paper is clear, but in general the references need to be updated. The researcher should add more new references in general from introduction, literature and methods if available to support the study with modern studies.

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

the conclusion is accurate and supported by the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The researcher should add more new references in general from introduction, literature and methods if available to support the study with modern studies. Especially, using references with new perspectives that enhance the modernity of the study.

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]

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]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- Review the article again and update references.
- Review the methodology and results. They need to be more clarified and explained how the researcher formulated them and found the results.

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title is good representation of the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The content of the abstract provides clear presentation of the study objectives, methods, and results. If this is governed by APA writing standards, the abstract needs to be only one paragraph.

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

A general overview revealed good alignment on writing mechanics. The reference list seems to be well-aligned with APA standards.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The content of this section is thorough. However, presentation might be more clear if tables were used to convey some of the information versus narrative such as 4, 6, and 7.

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

There is good clarity with the information throughout the article.

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

The conclusion section provides good summary reflection and presentation of the study discussion in the paper, along with helpful suggestions for further research to build on this study.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

There is thorough integration of many relevant references for support.

*Please rate the **TITLE** of this paper.*

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

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

4

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):

See note about using only one paragraph for the abstract and also the note about using tables for some of the information 4, 6, and 7 in the Methods section to present more clarity versus the narrative presentation.
