

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_120265
Title of the Manuscript:	Job satisfaction level among the tea garden workers in Biswanath district of Assam
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The findings offer valuable insights for policymakers and industry leaders aiming to enhance the welfare and satisfaction of tea garden workers, suggesting essential steps such as enhancing wage structures, ensuring regular payments, improving working conditions and safety measures, and fostering positive relationships between workers and superiors .	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is do not reflect the content of this article Suggestion title is "The effect of socioeconomic on job satisfaction level among workers in the Biswanath district of Assam tea farm".	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract no to revise. The abstract provides a general overview of the research but lacks specific details about the methodology and findings, which are crucial for understanding the depth of the study. The place and duration of the study must be explained in the methodology part.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Missing literature review part in the article. Please add literature review on Job satisfaction, supervisor behavior, socioeconomic; (wage and salary amount, wage regularity, working hours, working conditions, training facility), and work safety. Explain how socioeconomic affects workers job satisfaction in tea farm. Explain how supervisor behavior effect on workers job satisfaction in tea farm. Explain how work safety behavior effect on workers job satisfaction in tea farm. Please add theory and study framework.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The methodology section lacks information on the specific criteria used for selecting the 138 respondents from various tea growing regions of Biswanath District. Please tell the reader how you derived the sample size for your study. What method do you use to determine the sample size in your study? Details information on measurement of each variable must be mention. Satisfaction was not mentioned here. Writer must inform total number of items for each variable in the study and it was adapted from which original resource.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	References to little, some of the statements in the article are requires for reliable and latest high impact article for your reference.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used in the research paper is clear and straightforward, making it accessible to a wide audience	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Nor Azma Binti Rahlin
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Malaysia