

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_95409
Title of the Manuscript:	investigating The Impact of Job Insecurity and Burnout Towards Employee Performance in Mitsubishi Pontianak: The Mediating Role of Work Engagement
Type of the Article	Original research
Date received	January 07, 2023
Date due	January 12, 2023

### 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> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>		
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The topic of the research is practical and contemporary This is a good paper The abstract is good, it represents the paper in its parts. Some proofreading needed [see suggestions] Keywords are adequate Introduction and background are appropriate, clear, and streamlined. Used relevant references and updated to support the subject. Add briefly how this paper was divided. The Literature review is adequate, relevant, and streamlined and sufficient to support the research The Methodology representation is clear. Includes the model proposed [Hypotheses] and explains the work intended. The Results section is clear. Tables and Figure are good except that all decimals must be reported consistently using dots not commas. Results support well the discussion. The Discussion is adequate, clear, and streamlined. Enough validation was added to support the findings and outcomes. Conclusion is adequate. Limitations were not addressed... Implications and recommendations are not addressed... References Review carefully the write up of the references for consistency and match with journal requirements... Make sure all citations are reported and there are no extra references used in the text!!! Minor Proofreading is needed</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Hussin Jose Hejase
Department, University & Country	Al Maaref University, Lebanon