

Review Form 1.8

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJESS_120102 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | ANALYSIS OF DETERMINANTS OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN RELATIONS TO STAFF PRODUCTIVITY IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES IN AKWA IBOM STATE, NIGERIA |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

Review Form 1.8

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i></p> | <p>The manuscript provides valuable insight into the analysis of determinants of performance appraisal in relations to staff productivity and its findings present new knowledge that may also be used by future researchers to substantiate studies that may fall within the same discipline. At the same time the study followed the generally acceptable structure of a scientific process and ethical procedures, e.g clear objectives, literature review, methodology, findings, recommendations for future studies, correct referencing and citations. The study is also supported by a review of other empirical studies. The study adheres to ethical standards of gathering data, e.g used questionnaires which were evaluated by experts before they were administered. The researcher did not deviate from the focus of the study and study objectives. Data gathering instruments were tested for validity and reliability.</p> | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>The title is excellent, very concise, relevant, accurate and very informative to the reader. The title is consistent with the arguments raised in the abstract, introduction, problem statement, objectives, and literature review, conclusions made by other scholars, findings, conclusion and recommendations. No need to change the title.</p> | |
| <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> | <p>Very comprehensive because it provides an overview or summary of the whole study, and reflects the main purpose for the study. The methodology, sampling strategy, data collection, findings and conclusion are clearly outlined. By reading the abstract, the reader can get a clue of what the study is about.</p> | |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p>The subsections are appropriate to the manuscripts. They are logically arranged to support the main research title.</p> | |
| <p>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i></p> | <p>The overall narrative flows from the title, is concise and the work of other scholars or researchers have been acknowledged and correctly cited. The objectives are in line with the main aim and topic. Author tried to be original and was consistent throughout the paper by addressing the main research question and objectives. Literature review is also in line with the title and scholars who have conducted studies on performance management have been correctly cited and acknowledged. The research data was presented in tables and further explanation was given for the reader to easily understand. The paper ends with a conclusion that gives and overall impression of the study, and recommendations that can help improve performance appraisal for staff working in university libraries.</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> | <p>Even though there might be other references, but the author managed to get the most recent and relevant sources to support arguments in the study. For this publication, the references are sufficient and every sub-topic found within the study is extensively done.</p> | |

Review Form 1.8

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Language is extremely excellent | |
| Optional/General comments | Generally a well-structured, informative manuscript. Many scholars will find it interesting. | |

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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Name: | Elvis Mahlasela Shongwe |
| Department, University & Country | South Africa |