

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJEBA_92249 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | THE EFFECT OF EXECUTIVE COMPETENCE AND INTEGRITY ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE: MOTIVATION AS A MEDIATION |
| Type of the Article | Original Research 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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript requires proofreading. There are lot of grammatical mistakes that needs to be addressed. The recommendations provided do not match with what the study results indicate. For example, the study does not talk about leaders problem solving and developing innovations. Recommendations should only be limited to what the study results are related to variables of the study. Do not include variables that you have not studied in your recommendations. What is the theory supporting your model of the study? There is no underlying theory. Need to discuss your theory and link it with your model. What is the total population of BPRS? The authors have only focused on one province and calculated the sample size. How data was collected from the employees? What sampling technique was adopted by the authors? How common method bias was addressed in the study? | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the literature review, leader's competence should be the focus. The authors have focused more on employee competence than on leader's competence. The authors should focus on why H3 has been rejected with sound discussion. The discussion provided is superficial only. | |
| Optional/General comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the introduction section, last paragraph, the general impression as a reader I got is that the BPRS executives have competence and integrity issues. Use consistent referencing style. | |

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: | Chaudhry Shoaib Akhtar |
| Department, University & Country | Fatima Jinnah Women University, Pakistan |