

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The purport of the present study was to investigate the person-job fit and employee creativity and the moderating effect of leader support reflects the organizational climate. Moreover, employee creativity is one of the 21 st Century skills. Hence, it holds good for the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	'The Role of leader support in Person-Job Fit and Employee Creativity' would suffice.	
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.	The abstract contains 238 words with 03 key words. Specifically, the present journal viz., Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting (ISSN: 2456-639X) urges an abstract should be based on the following lines: 1. Aims; 2. Study design; 3. Place and duration of study/ sample ; 4. Methodology; 5. Results and 6. Conclusion. Further, the abstract should be written in past tense.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Introduction, materials and methods, Results (Validity and Reliability Test, descriptive analysis, hypothesis testing, correlation analysis, Regression Analysis) discussion and Theoretical implications and Managerial implications; Limitations and suggestions for future research and conclusion were made.	
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.	1. Validity and Reliability Test should have been included under the heading Materials and methods. 2. Why Theoretical implications and managerial implication were drawn separately? 3. Under limitations you have mentioned the total sample is 165, whereas under Table 2 you stated n=155 and under Table 3. N+245, please clarify. 4. No conclusion should have been made after suggestions for future research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Nearly 72 references with recent authors were cited but haphazardly. How Koffi, B. A., Campbell, J., (2024). Incorporated between Boon, E. K., et al (2021) and Brown, G. E., Rive, A. C., Ferrari, M. C., & Chivers, D. P. (2006).	
Minor REVISION comments	Language competence is good but still it can be improved.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The present journal advises a length of 3000-6000 words but your article carries 6798 words. . Further, about 4-8 keywords are expected but you supplied only 03 key words. In stead of 'gotten' the word 'obtained' may be used. (abstract) All the hypotheses were all supported. (reframe the sentence) Subsequently, (Woodman et al. 1993) stated a connection point model (p.12) why the authors name is in brackets. 	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	N. Samuel Babu
Department, University & Country	Holy Mary Institute Of Technology And Science, India