

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_92811
Title of the Manuscript:	WORK ETHOS AS MEDIATOR THE INFLUENCE OF HUMAN RELATION AND PHYSICAL WORK ENVIRONMENT ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE
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

Major Revision	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>1.The main issue is with the paper's topic. In the title of the paper, the researcher discusses work ethos, but in the literature review and hypothesis development process, the researcher explains work ethics. These are two distinct variables that must be revised in the paper's topic and literature.</p> <p>2. There are several grammatical errors in the paper that should be corrected.</p> <p>3. The variables in the study must be coherent.</p> <p>4. The abstract should be brief and easy to understand.</p> <p>5. What are the research's theoretical and practical contributions?</p> <p>6. Please explain the research's limitations and recommendations in a separate heading.</p> <p>7.The literature is very short; more articles should be added, and each independent, dependent, and mediating relationship should be explained in a heading.</p> <p>Need major Revision</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> To begin with, the issue confuses me; the author discusses work ethics in the topic, yet the researcher discusses the connection between work ethics and employee performance in the process of developing hypotheses. The author must first define the topic. Separate sections for the theoretical and practical contributions should be included. The author should mention any restrictions and suggestions. You write like 0,255 in the results section when it should read like 0.255. The entire manuscript needs to be checked by the researcher. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>. There is a number of grammatical and academic mistakes please go through thoroughly.</p> <p>. Results showed be checked again</p> <p>Need minor revision</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Overall, the paper format is satisfactory, but the literature, discussion, recommendations, and limitations require significant revision.</p> <p>There is a need to delve deeper into the study's problem.</p>	

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)

Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Waqar Ahmad
Department, University & Country	School of Business, University of Central Punjab, Pakistan