

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_87969
Title of the Manuscript:	Neo-Liberal Workplace and Labour Process Analysis: resilience of Dialectics in Understanding Consent and Resistance in the Workplace.
Type of the Article	Review Article

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:

(<https://www.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-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>This was originally a very good topic, and I like it very much. However, this article does not clearly explain this topic. I will not repeat the aspects that are well written. The following only points out some problems (perhaps my understanding is not completely correct).</p> <p>First of all, the abstract does not correspond to the text, at least it does not explain the logical relationship between the most important titles clearly. I think the abstract should be rewritten by the author.</p> <p>Second, maybe it's the problem of editing documents. I can't see and understand the framework of the article clearly and completely. I recommend that authors use the following styles</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1.1 1.2 2. 2.1 2.2 3. 3.1 3.2 4 <p>Third, the whole document is a review article, but it does not reflect relatively new theoretical results, but uses old materials, which in itself reduces the quality of the article. It is suggested that the author still choose this topic, and it will be more valuable to summarize the research in the last 10 years.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zhu Guohua
Department, University & Country	Zhejiang College, China