

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_101919
Title of the Manuscript:	THE IMPACT OF SERVANT LEADERSHIP TOWARD JOB SATISFACTION AND TURNOVER INTENTION THROUGH EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AS MEDIATING VARIABLE ON COMMUNITY HEALTH CARE CENTERS IN BENGKAYANG
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.journalajebo.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)
<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>Yes</p> <p>The study only presents the relationship between servant leadership, job satisfaction, and turnover intention as mediated by employee engagement. The impact of these variables was not measured in the study.</p> <p>Yes, but sentence construction needs to be improved for easy comprehension by the readers</p> <p>I think the theoretical theory should not be part of the methodology, it would be better if there would be a separate section for this part.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Recent references should be added</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are some grammatical and sentence construction errors in this manuscript. Subjecting it to the scrutiny/proofreading by a native English speaker or a professional English critic would improve the technical quality of the write-up of this manuscript</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It would be better to discuss in the methodology the criteria used in purposive sampling to justify how the respondents were selected. Results and discussion can also be improved by explaining the meaning of the computed value in each hypothesis tested and interpreting its implication in the study area. Citing the findings of related studies and comparing and contrasting these with the findings of the present study would also enrich the discussion of the results of the study.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Imee D. Esguerra
Department, University & Country	Bulacan Agricultural State College, Philippines