



Paper: “Exploring the Impact of Parent-Adolescent Conflict on Adolescent Academic Performance, Retention, and Concentration in the South Dayi District, Ghana”

Submitted: 15 September 2025

Accepted: 13 January 2026

Published: 31 January 2026

Corresponding Author: Felicia Esinam Pufaa

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n1p110

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ricardo Furfaro

University of Business & Social Sciences, Argentina

Reviewer 2: Josephine W. Gitome

Kenyatta University, Kenya

Reviewer 3: Blinded

EJES 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: EJES 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.

EJES editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands EJES out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Re-imagining the Role of Postgraduate Research towards a Research-Intensive University in Namibia	
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: Yes	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. The title accurately reflects the paper’s focus on postgraduate research and its role in developing a research-intensive university in Namibia	5
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. The abstract clearly states the objectives and context but does not specify the conceptual method or summarize concrete findings.	3
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

The text is generally well written with only occasional minor typos and awkward phrasing (e.g., “objects” instead of “objectives”).

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
As a conceptual paper, it lacks a dedicated methods section detailing how the analysis was conducted, making the approach unclear.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
The body is logically organized and informative, though some sections are overly long and contain repetitive points that could be tightened.	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Literature Review (Section 2) beginning with “Many conceptual frameworks explaining higher education goals...” (page 6, para 1) through to “...ranking criteria for a research-intensive university.” Why it’s long: Five dense paragraphs (pp. 6–7) cover global and African research investment, IARU criteria, UNESCO statistics, and peer-review concerns—all without sub-headings or breaks. 2. “A Re-imagined Role of Postgraduate Research...” (Section 4) from the opening discussion of government support (page 11, para 1) through the detailed Fredua-Kwarteng strategies (page 13, para 4). Why it’s long: Four consecutive paragraphs (pp. 11–13) revisit funding needs, leadership challenges, infrastructure requirements, and student-engagement programs, repeating similar points 	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Conclusions summarize the discussion appropriately but remain quite general and could better tie back to specific objectives presented earlier.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
References are broad and relevant, covering theory, policy documents, and empirical studies, providing strong support for the arguments.	

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):

The paper's topic and literature grounding are strong, but it requires a clear methods description and a more focused abstract and conclusion to meet publication standards.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: it can be published after revision

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

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

It is always recommended that title fully reflects the contents of the manuscript. Mere "influence" of parent-adolescent conflict on academic retention does not exactly align with the contents. Referring to "impact" seems to be more adequate.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

In terms of purpose of the study, it is unclear as to whether the aim is to analyze what the impact is on adolescent academic retention (referred to in the title) or on academic performance, as it is reflected in other sections of the manuscript. Retention and performance are 2 different concepts. With respect to problem explanation, it is key to specify that the article refers to negative (and not positive) consequences/implications on academic retention or performance arising from parent-adolescent conflict.

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

There are a few grammatical errors in the manuscript (i.e. in Introduction, Results & Discussion). Long sentences make it difficult to grasp exact meanings. English language syntax should also be revised

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Methods are clearly specified and explained.

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

Body of paper does not contain errors. For clarity purposes, it is advisable to divide "Results" from "Discussion" (effects) into two completely separate sections.

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

Conclusion is accurate and supported by content

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

References are comprehensive and appropriate. In-text citations should be reviewed to make sure they are included in the list of references.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

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!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Thank you for the submission of your manuscript. The study deals with a very critical topic which has very relevant connotations in the social and economic fields in a very difficult context. Please review each of the comments in the different sections above, to come up with an improved version of your document in terms of clarity and quality.
