

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_99954
Title of the Manuscript:	PERCEPTION OF WORK ETHICS AND PROFESSIONALISM ON WORK OUTPUT OF HALL ASSISTANTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION, WINNEBA
Type of the 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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>PERCEPTION OF WORK ETHICS AND PROFESSIONALISM ON WORK OUTPUT OF HALL ASSISTANTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION, WINNEBA</p> <p>Dear Authors, Thank you very much for your study. However, several issues found in the manuscript within which authors need to address those concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Abstract: please provide the methods, results, discussion, and conclusion in the abstract - Methods: The authors did not elaborate the characteristics of participants - Methods: The authors did not mention which formulas used to determine the minimum samples as well as the ethics approval where appropriate. - Results: The authors need to present the data in proportionate ways and explain interpretations in the paragraph accordingly. Provide the strength and limitation of the study - References: The authors are encouraged to use current references (there are several references more than 10 years). 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	N Juni Triastuti
Department, University & Country	University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Indonesia