EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute
15 YEARS

Paper: **"Motherhood, Career Aspirations, and Life Goals: Exploring Young Women's Attitudes as a Factor in the Declining Fertility Rate in Sri Lanka"**

Submitted: 18 August 2025
Accepted: 18 September 2025
Published: 30 September 2025

Corresponding Author: Iresha Lakshman

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n26p29

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Valentin Antohi
Dunarea de Jos University of Galati, Romania

Reviewer 2: Maria Bordas
National University of Public Service, Hungary

Reviewer 3: Muhammed Obomeghie
Auchi Polytechnic, Nigeria

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025*
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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: Prof. Dr. Maria Bordas	
University/Country: National University of Public Service	
Date Manuscript Received: 29/08/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/09/2025
Manuscript Title: From Reporting to Responsibility: Legal Innovations in Corporate Law and Governance under the examples of the EU's "Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD)"	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree that 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 for the content of the article.	**4**
The writing style of the article is transparent and easy to understand. Its organization effectively conveys the article's point. The few grammatical faults it contains—mostly commas—do not affect its readability.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**5**
The abstract effectively conveys the essence of the problem. In addition, it is grammatically excellent and adequately reflects the new legal solutions in corporate law and corporate governance that have arisen in the modern world.	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
Yes, there are a few grammatical errors, mostly commas. However, it does not affect its readability. *However, I am not sure whether the author is the teacher of the Hamburg or Hambug University. I ask the author to correct this if it is a typographical error.*	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
Yes, the study methods are adequate and clear.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
The conclusions drawn logically follow from the structure of the article and the scientific problem propositions and solution ideas formulated in it. The author concludes her research material with individual, scientifically useful conclusions that can also be used by the scientific community and readers.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
The scientific problem's formulation and debate also demonstrate brave, inventive scientific thought, which is unquestionably deserving of praise and definitely worth recognizing. *The conclusions drawn reflect scientific thinking at a high level, follow absolutely logically from the structure of the article, and reveal the scientific problem propositions, solution ideas, and valuable ideas formulated at a high level.*	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
In one word, completely. The dissertation uses eighteen references, which is more than sufficient considering the size of the article. In addition, the author refers to significant figures in the field of science, so the completed work is highly referenced.	

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):
Please check the name of the University.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
This paper is nice and an extremely vulnerable job.

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025*
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: Dr Muhammed A. Obomeghie	
University/Country: Auchi Polytechnic. Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 25th August, 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 26th August, 2025
Manuscript Title: Motherhood, career aspirationand life goals: Exploring young women's attitudes as a factor in the declining fertility rates in Sri Lanker	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 29-1	
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.	**5**
The title is clear and adequate to the content of the study	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**5**
The abstract presents clear objectives, methods and findings of the study	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
The grammatical errors and spelling mistakes are few	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
The methods are are clearly explained and adequate for the study	

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
The results are clear with few errors	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
The conclusion is largely in line with the objectives of the study	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**3**
The references are adequate but not in line with the latest APA method. Each reference must include its unique DOI	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and re-submission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Some of the weakness identified in this work includes:

- The sample used in this study were taken from one University , this may not give an adequate generalization.
- The references are not in line with the latest APA methods
- Most of the references are over ten years old. This makes the references a little bit outdated.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The article is hereby recommended for publication subject to the above listed suggestions.

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025*
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: Prof. dr. Valentin Marian Antohi	
University/Country: Dunarea de Jos University of Galati	
Date Manuscript Received: 19.08.2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 21.08.2025
Manuscript Title: **Motherhood, Career Aspirations, and Life Goals: Exploring Young Women's Attitudes as a Factor in the Declining Fertility Rate in Sri Lanka**	
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:	

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 title is clear, well-formulated, and directly reflects the article's content, highlighting the relationship between motherhood, career aspirations, and fertility decline in Sri Lanka.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**4**
The abstract is comprehensive and highlights the objectives, methodology, and main results. However, it would benefit from a clearer emphasis on the study's original contribution compared to existing literature.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**

The article is written in good academic language, with very few linguistic errors. A minor stylistic revision is recommended to remove redundancies.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
The methodology is well-structured and appropriate to the objectives. However, further clarification would be useful regarding the selection of interview participants and the validation of qualitative data.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
The results are presented coherently, supported by statistical data and complemented by qualitative quotes. The tables are relevant, but their interpretation could be enhanced by a synthetic conceptual scheme.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
The conclusions are well-grounded and reflect the results obtained. However, they could be written more concisely and with greater focus, avoiding repetition.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
The reference list is appropriate and up-to-date. It is recommended to check citation style consistency and complete missing details for some references.	

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):