

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_116713</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>MANAGING CHANGE: CONSIDERATIONS FOR EFFECTIVE HUMAN RESOURCE INTERVENTIONS - THE CASE OF THE COUNCIL FOR SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH, GHANA</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>COMMENTS TO AUTHOR(S)</p> <p>Manuscript: <b>"MANAGING CHANGE: CONSIDERATIONS FOR EFFECTIVE HUMAN RESOURCE INTERVENTIONS - THE CASE OF THE COUNCIL FOR SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH, GHANA"</b>.</p> <p>The paper presents a study to find out the relationship between effective leadership and sustainable development. Below are the recommended revisions to be made. Some major problems are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In introduction, the author(s) used the abbreviation 'CSIR-FORIG' but was confusing for the readers who do not know the term. The abbreviations can only be used in the later part of the manuscript after the full term is mentioned first at the beginning. Manuscripts should be readers-focused and cannot let the readers find its meaning by themselves.</li> <li>2. It is hard to conclude in a way that "change management implementation at CSIR-FORIG did not yield the needed outcome because the HR was not adequately incorporated in the implementation strategy". There can be other reasons such as misunderstanding of the questionnaire and concept that they did not know well how best to respond or the sample size and selection matter which is the misrepresentation of the responded samples.</li> <li>3. In 2.2, the author(s) stated "In each category a representative sample size of 30% was randomly taken This brought the total sample to fifty-four (64)". What is the assumption of taking 30%? Please support previous scholars o literature review for that.</li> <li>4. In 2.3, the author(s) stated "a set of survey structured questionnaires using coded answers and administered them using google forms and follow up telephone calls and text messages. The questions were coded to indicate degree of correctness or appropriateness of statement. We allowed staff category that needed assistance to answer the survey questionnaire on face-to-face basis". This procedure is aimed at structuring qualitative research rather than quantitative one.</li> <li>5. Numerous punctuation mistakes – need a full stop at the end of sentences such as last line of second paragraph in 2.3 and in 2.5 and so on. In 2.4, there is only a close bracket. The open bracket is either missing or brackets not needed. In second paragraph of 4.2, for example, there needs a space between a word and an in-text citation. Please check all those mistakes in the whole manuscript as it is hard to mention all those in the comment.</li> <li>6. In 2.4, a grammatical mistake – should be a SPSS spreadsheet.</li> <li>7. In 3.3, the author(s) stated "However, the remaining 30 (46.9%) respondents could not confirm". Those who answered they do not know is between 15 to 20 according to the figure, and thus cannot say the remaining 30 could not confirm. The level of agreeableness only varies, and it is a different story if we interpret "do not agree" as "not confirmed".</li> <li>8. Reference style is very different to each other. Please standardize the format. Publication year is sometimes stated after the author's name but sometimes in the middle. Sometimes, the volume and issue number were stated as 2(2) but, in some references, it becomes Vol.8, No.31. before the last author's name, the symbol '&amp;' was used while some references were written with 'and'. It sounds like the author(s) copied and pasted the references from here and there rather than re-writing those in one format. Please try to align and follow the standard reference style needed by the publisher.</li> <li>9. It would be better if the author(s) could add the survey questionnaire under appendix.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>		

**Review Form 1.7**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Win Naing Soe
Department, University & Country	Lincoln University College, Myanmar