



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Access to Leadership Positions and Career Trajectories among Georgian and American Women in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries”

Submitted: 22 May 2026

Accepted: 15 July 2026

Published: 31 July 2026

Corresponding Author: Salome Tcharbadze

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n20p30

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Saverio Lovergine
Tor Vergata University of Rome, Italy

Reviewer 2: Ernest Ampomah Arkoh
European Institute of Mgt. & Tech., Switzerland

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

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

The title is appropriate and consistent with the content of the article. However, it could benefit from a slight stylistic refinement in academic English, particularly by replacing “XX–XXI” with the full written form. (e.g. APA or MLA).

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

The abstract is well developed and effectively introduces the article, providing a clear and comprehensive overview of its objectives, comparative scope, methodological approach, principal findings, and practical implications.

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

The manuscript is readable and written in competent academic English. The prose is generally fluent, and the line of argument is easy to follow. A small number of stylistic and editorial issues remain, including occasional long or slightly unclear sentences, some repetition, and minor formatting inconsistencies. These points do not affect the substance of the paper, but a careful editorial revision would further improve its clarity, readability, and overall effectiveness.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodological section provides a clear overview of the study’s overall design, configuring it as a qualitative comparative literature review complemented by policy analysis and grounded in recent reports, statistical sources, and reference theoretical contributions. The comparative focus on the United States and Georgia is also well justified. This section could, however, benefit from a more detailed explanation of the research strategy, source selection procedures, inclusion and exclusion criteria, and the analytical framework guiding the comparison. In its current form, the manuscript reads primarily as a narrative comparative review; a more explicit methodological framework would further strengthen its transparency, reproducibility, and overall scholarly rigor.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The manuscript presents a coherent and well-structured comparative discussion, and its main analytical arguments are communicated clearly. The sections addressing leadership barriers, care work, flexible working arrangements, and intersectional inequalities are logically organized and complement one another effectively. The comparative table is also a useful feature, as it helps synthesize the main points of convergence and divergence between the two contexts examined.

Since the study is based on a review of the literature and policy analysis rather than on original empirical data, the term “results” is best understood in an interpretive sense. In this respect, some of the conclusions—particularly where the discussion moves from the literature review to broader policy implications—could perhaps be framed with slightly greater caution. A clearer distinction between the evidence considered, the authors’ interpretation, and the resulting policy recommendations would further enhance the analytical precision of the manuscript.

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

The conclusion is consistent with the overall argument of the manuscript and provides a clear summary of the main findings. It appropriately highlights the cumulative and institutional character of inequality in women's leadership in both national contexts. The policy recommendations proposed in the conclusion are also in line with the issues discussed in the document, particularly in relation to care infrastructure, transparency of promotions and flexible working arrangements. The conclusion would be even stronger if it highlighted the limitations of cross-national comparability and the absence of original empirical data. Nonetheless, it is well aligned with the body of the manuscript and offers a meaningful summary of the article's contribution.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The bibliography combines foundational theoretical contributions with recent reports relevant to gender, labour markets, and inequalities in access to leadership. This breadth is a notable strength of the manuscript and reflects a serious engagement with the topic. At the same time, the correspondence between in-text citations and the reference list should be carefully verified to ensure full consistency throughout. Moreover, while the use of institutional reports and policy documents is appropriate given the comparative and applied orientation of the study, the manuscript would benefit from a stronger integration of recent academic scholarship, which would further improve the overall balance of the references. Overall, the bibliography is relevant and appropriate, though it would benefit from a consistency check and some moderate strengthening.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This manuscript addresses a relevant and timely topic with clear sociological and economic significance. Her comparative focus on women's access to leadership in Georgia and the United States is significant and highlights the interplay between organizational structures, care responsibilities, flexible working arrangements, and broader institutional inequalities that differ from each other. The document is well structured, accessible and potentially valuable for readers interested in gender policies, the labour market and social policies. At the same time, it would benefit from a review in some parts of the paper. In particular, the methodological section should be strengthened through a clearer explanation of the search strategy, source selection criteria, and comparative logic. The manuscript would also benefit from a more explicit articulation of the specific analytical contribution of the Georgia–United States comparison. Furthermore, a more balanced integration of recent peer-reviewed academic literature along with institutional and policy sources would further enhance its academic base. Revising the title, including a brief discussion of the study's limitations, ensuring full consistency between in-text citations and the reference list, and refining the style would also improve the manuscript. In summary, this is a promising and relevant contribution, with a solid conceptual basis, but which would be strengthened by greater methodological transparency, a clearer definition of its original added value, and a more rigorous use of sources.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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: Dr. Joyce Muthoni Mbaya	
University, Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: June 26, 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: July 7, 2026
Manuscript Title: Access to Leadership Positions and Career Trajectories for Georgian and American Women (XX-XXI)	
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: 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 for the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Abstract and later information in the article includes “uninterrupted” career trajectories. Consistency is key.	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> - Indication of the time period instead of indicating “recent international reports” How recent is recent? - Did the study have an objective? Indicate the objective before the presentation of the argument of the study.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No. Grammar is good	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes. - However, the variables of the study are not clear. - Contradiction between the introduction (that - This article investigates access to leadership positions and career trajectories for Georgian and American women from the twentieth to the twenty-first century, with particular attention to contemporary barriers). While methodology indicates: The review prioritizes materials published between 2020 and 2026, while also incorporating foundational theories that remain necessary for conceptual analysis). Clarify the distinction between the <u>historical period being examined</u> and the <u>publication period of the literature reviewed</u>, or revise the sections to ensure consistency - The scope on the period of the time is also ambiguous. Consider narrowing the scope to align the study objectives with the review period. - Align the study checkpoints (variables). Note the inconsistency from abstract, introduction and methodology section that is ... (The article also follows a life-course perspective, examining career trajectories as cumulative sequences of education, entry into employment, early promotion, family formation, flexible work, mid-career advancement, and senior leadership access.) Here, new study variables have been introduced)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> For the presented study areas, the results are in tandem.	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study variables with the conclusions are fairly discussed.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There is a high reliance on few documents in the study, as much as this is a literature review. Intext citations of major claims and also of certain sections are missing – e.g Cultural expectations, no citation.	

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):

- **Indicate intext situations for major claim, for example, the first paragraph of the introduction does not have citations on source of the claims.**
- **Include objective(s), to help guide the reader to the aim of the study**
- **Align a conceptual framework with the objectives, for an interaction of the variables under study**
- **A definition of the main terms (e.g. contemporary patterns in women career, caregiving flexible work, and intersectional inequalities... (with a conceptual framework, the variables of the study can be clearer in showing the reader the variables in the comparison of the study.**
- **Theoretical review – indicate the proponents of the thoery and the year of the proposed theory**
- **Discussion – enhance the study literature, since the study is a literature review. (there is a high reliance on LeanIn.Org & McKinsey & Company, 2024;)**