

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_129375
Title of the Manuscript:	Strategic Leadership and Cross-Generational Management: Strategies for Engaging Multigenerational Workforces
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript offers valuable contributions to the scientific community by addressing a crucial and timely topic: managing multigenerational workforces through strategic leadership. Its integration of the Upper Echelons Theory with practical strategies like tailored communication, mentorship, and flexible work arrangements provides a robust framework for improving productivity and inclusivity. The manuscript's strength lies in its ability to combine theoretical insights with actionable recommendations, making it relevant for both researchers and practitioners. However, its reliance on secondary sources limits the generalizability of its conclusions, and incorporating empirical case studies could significantly enhance its impact and applicability across diverse organizational contexts.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript, "Strategic Leadership and Cross-Generational Management: Strategies for Engaging Multigenerational Workforces," is relevant and captures the core focus of the study effectively. However, it could benefit from being slightly more concise while maintaining its descriptive nature. A possible alternative could be: " Strategic Leadership in Multigenerational Workforces: Bridging Generational Divides for Enhanced Engagement. " This alternative reflects the manuscript's focus on leadership strategies and cross-generational management while being more streamlined.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the manuscript is well-structured and provides a clear overview of the topic, theoretical foundation, key strategies, and practical implications. It successfully highlights the manuscript's originality by addressing leadership within multigenerational workforces. However, to improve its comprehensiveness, consider the following suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inclusion of Key Challenges: While the abstract mentions actionable guidance and strategies, it could briefly touch on the key challenges faced in multigenerational workforce management to provide a balanced view. 2. Focus on Methodology: Adding a sentence about the methodology (e.g., literature review, theoretical analysis) would give readers a clearer understanding of the manuscript's approach. 3. Clarify Practical Implications: The abstract could elaborate slightly on the "actionable guidance" provided, perhaps mentioning one or two specific strategies or recommendations. <p>Overall, these adjustments would enhance the abstract's clarity and ensure it fully represents the scope and contributions of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically sound, as it effectively integrates the Upper Echelons Theory to provide a theoretical basis for understanding leadership's role in managing multigenerational workforces. The cited references and supporting literature are relevant, credible, and appropriately aligned with the key arguments and strategies proposed. The recommendations are practical and supported by existing research, making the conclusions logical and well-founded.</p> <p>However, to further strengthen the manuscript's scientific rigor, consider the following suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Empirical Evidence: Incorporating empirical data or case studies would bolster the validity of the proposed strategies and enhance their applicability across different organizational contexts. 2. Broader Scope: While the manuscript references global practices, it could further address cultural or sector-specific variations to improve generalizability. 3. Mitigating Limitations: A more detailed discussion of the limitations of the Upper Echelons Theory in the context of multigenerational workforce management would add depth and critical reflection to the analysis. <p>Addressing these points would enhance the scientific integrity and practical value of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript are generally sufficient, relevant, and include recent sources that effectively support the study's arguments. The inclusion of prominent theories like the Upper Echelons Theory and recent studies on generational workforce dynamics strengthens the foundation of the analysis. However, there are areas where additional or updated references could enhance the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Empirical Studies: While the manuscript is well-supported by theoretical and secondary sources, adding references to recent empirical studies or case examples could further substantiate the strategies proposed. 2. Global Perspectives: Incorporating references that address generational workforce management practices in underrepresented regions (e.g., Asia, Africa, or South America) would broaden the manuscript's applicability and relevance. 3. Technological Impacts: Given the manuscript's emphasis on generational differences and workplace strategies, additional references exploring the impact of emerging technologies, such as AI or hybrid work models, on multigenerational engagement could add depth. <p>For instance, recent works on workplace diversity by organizations such as McKinsey or studies on digital adaptation in multigenerational teams could serve as valuable additions.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the manuscript are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, professional, and adheres to academic standards, effectively conveying complex ideas in a structured manner. However, there are a few areas where improvements could enhance readability and precision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conciseness: Some sections, particularly in the introduction and theoretical discussions, could be more concise to maintain reader engagement while avoiding redundancy. 2. Technical Terms: Ensure consistent use and explanation of technical terms (e.g., "Upper Echelons Theory") to make the content accessible to a broader audience, including those less familiar with the theory. 3. Proofreading: A thorough review for minor grammatical issues, sentence structure, and word choice could further polish the manuscript for scholarly publication. <p>These refinements would elevate the manuscript's overall clarity and alignment with the standards of scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>A.Madhuri</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Andhra Loyola College, India</p>