

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJEBA_109193</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Breaking the Silence: Revolutionizing Organizational Performance through Employee Voice</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Emperical</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<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> (Yes)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Yes to a great extent.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes ok type</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. Need to add more recent literature in the domain area.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. It is a novel concept. While the manuscript appears to be well-executed, it does not appear to have added much or advanced the past research in this area. Especially, more attention needs to be paid to the problematization of your research issues. The questions to ask include "Why am I conducting this research?" "What is the problem that I am trying to resolve by conducting this research" and "What is the paper's contribution to existing literature " for example. it is rather unclear how the present paper contributes to the literature. A more robust engagement with the conceptual categories to distill a theoretical argument is imperative.</p> <p>2. How did you draw the purpose of your study need to justify the statements?</p> <p>3. Justify how did you drew hypothesis; Research gap is missing.</p> <p>4. Please link this analysis to your contribution and implications in a stronger way.</p> <p>5. Your discussion and conclusion sections will also need to be more substantial and meaningful. You need to place your findings within the literature and indicate how it contributes to the discussion.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Ok, Need improvement in language.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Added above.	

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sunil Kumar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>GITAM School of Business, GITAM Deemed to be University, India</b>