

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_98994
Title of the Manuscript:	Are Perceived Organizational Support and Flexible Working Arrangement Able to Influence Employee Engagement among Millennials?
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.journalajebea.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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. The aim of this study was to examine the relationship between perceived organizational support and flexible work arrangements for millennial employee engagement, while work-life balance was an intervening variable. 2. The title is good and suitable. 3. The abstract is comprehensive; it shows the aim, the data used to achieve the aim of the study, the tool used, and the findings. 4. The abstract should be written as paragraph, not by using titles. 5. The structure of the paper needs to be written again such as the methodology section and the result's one. The tables of reliability and validity are preferred to be written as appendixes at the end of the paper. The titles numbering regarding from the page 5 to the page 8 should be under the methodology title. 6. The paper is scientifically correct. It handles all the scientific steps in writing a research paper. 7. The references are sufficient and recent. Please, pay attention to the style of writing the references inside the text of the paper, some references were written as authors and their numbers, others, only numbers. So, unify.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Excellent language.	
Optional/General comments	It is a good research, but please you ought to pay attention to the comments written in the paper.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nawal Okour
Department, University & Country	AI Nawal Center for Translation and Research, Jordan