

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_100261</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A critically appraised topic on what is known in the scientific literature about the effects of flexible working interventions on Work-nonwork conflict and, Psychological well-being</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### 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.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/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><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></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. I think the researcher need to rephrase the topic, my suggestion is "The effects of Flexible Working Interventions on work-nonwork conflict and, psychological well-being: A Review of Literature.</p> <p>3. It seems to be comprehensive, but should maintain the uniformity of the referencing throughout.</p> <p>4. It seems to be fine</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. done some corrections, also need to mention that please re-check before submitting the article</p> <p>I strongly feel that the author to revisit the format of the article and do some revision on it, since the writings and other arrangements in the format look like the article does not maintain a uniformity.</p> <p>I have done some correction, but left some corrections to author as well, please do those.</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>It's OK, but I prefer to do proof reading</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Good work</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shaheeb Abdul Azeez</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The Maldives National University, Maldives</b>