

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	Review 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.	It is a highly relevant topic in today's dynamic workplace. Organizations are increasingly characterized by diverse age groups, from Gen Z to Baby Boomers, each bringing unique perspectives, skills, and expectations. This diversity presents both opportunities for innovation and challenges in aligning values, communication styles, and work habits.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	

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 methodology used to review the data is not explicitly stated in the article.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author could have started by outlining precise goals and the scholarly databases that are used to find pertinent literature, such as Scopus, Web of Science, and/or Google Scholar. Additionally, it could have stated that what keywords—such as "engagement strategies," "multigenerational workforce," and/or "strategic leadership"—were used to search the literature. 2. Author could have applied inclusion criteria like peer-reviewed articles published in the last 10–15 years and how he/she excluded irrelevant or non-English studies. 3. After carefully reviewing a few full texts and filtering titles and abstracts for relevancy, the author could have created a structured table with information on research goals, methods, conclusions, and contexts. 4. To summarize findings, pinpoint gaps, and suggest a conceptual framework, it would be advantageous if the author performed a thematic analysis. 5. The authors' conclusion might have included a critical evaluation of the study's robustness, pointing out areas that require more investigation, and organizing the results. 6. For organization and analysis, the author could have used programs like Mendeley or NVivo. 7. It would have been more significant for the readers if the author had identified the research gaps in sector-specific strategies, longitudinal studies to monitor changes over time, and emerging generational cohorts. 8. The critical appraisal would have helped to evaluate the study's robustness, including the suitability of methodologies, the sufficient sample size for generalization, and the evidence supporting the conclusions. 9. A conceptual framework for cross-generational management and strategic leadership, along with an overview of the results and industry comparisons, should be included if possible. 10. Organizing the findings by author(s), year, research objectives, methodology, key findings, industry, geography, and organizational size is advised by creating a data extraction table. 11. The author should have followed a process that includes reviewing abstracts and titles, examining full-text articles, and assessing quality using tools like PRISMA to guarantee relevance and support selection. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The following references—NASSCOM, 2023, World Bank, 2022, Adeyemi & Ogundipe, 2021, Statistics South Africa, 2022, UNDP, 2023, and Hoffman, 2020—are cited in the article but are not included in the list of references. The author ought to include them. 2. Although it is stated as Ng, E 2020 in the reference, the author cited Ng 2020 in the text. It is recommended that the article citation should be Ng, E 2020. 	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, except for few words where American English is used over British. It's up to the Journal to decide.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The article, due to its dependence on secondary sources, has a narrow focus on organizational and geographic contexts. The study has not adequately considered cultural, regional, or sector-specific variations, necessitating further empirical research to explore real-world case studies and practical applications.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment <i>(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)</i></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>Hemlata Agarwal</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Sarvajanik University, India</p>

Review Form 3