

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_126362
Title of the Manuscript:	Person-Job Fit and Employee Creativity: The Moderating Role of Leader Support
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Yes. The Research has been reported in systematic way. The manuscript is valuable because it explores the connections between person-job fit and employee creativity and the moderating effect of leader support by using a quantitative research approach in a bank in Nigeria. It addresses a relevant topic in human resource management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes. However, it requires proofreading.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is robust because quantitative research approach has been used and the research has been properly reported.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. The reference list includes research from 2000 to the most recent one of 2024. However, the 4th listing under References section needs to be checked for redundant words at end.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Minor copy editing and proofreading appears to be required.	

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:	K S S Kanhaiya
Department, University & Country	India