

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_91148
Title of the Manuscript:	ROLE OF MANAGEMENT IN ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE A Study of Tanzania Railways in Morogoro Region
Type of the Article	Original research

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The topic of the research is practical and contemporary</p> <p>The abstract is good, it represents the paper in its parts. However, the justification of the sample size is weak, to help you out, I added a reasonable justification with evidence in the body of the paper....[See corrected and edited Manuscript attached]</p> <p>Keywords must be added.... Missing</p> <p>Note: Make sure to remove all the numbers you used and leave instead the new numbering as required by the guidelines of the journal. To make it easier for you, I added all the new style numbers... You have to erase the small ones!!! [Superscripts]... through the paper....</p> <p>The paper needed a serious editing and proofreading that I volunteered for improvement and help... Follow suggestions and do all the required changes....</p> <p>Introduction and background are appropriate, clear and streamlined. All quoted statements are fully validated with relevant references. This section prepares the paper well for the next part fulfilling the objectives. However, follow all the recommended changes as a result of editing.....</p> <p>Methodology is clear however, the sample size justification needed a more concrete evidence, which I added for you...</p> <p>Results section is clear, through Tables. Enough to support the discussion of the findings</p> <p>Discussion is clear and streamlined, though poorly written. The discussion part fulfils the objectives of the paper. A major editing was performed for improvement and adding to your learning curve. [see suggestions]</p> <p>Conclusion and recommendations are not adequate. You need to rewrite them</p> <p>Carefully review the write up of the references to match Journal's requirements... Complete those missing details. Major change was suggested to follow the Journal's guidelines...</p> <p>Proofreading is still needed</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hussin Jose Hejase
Department, University & Country	Al Maaref University, Lebanon