

Review Form 1.8

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_120102
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF DETERMINANTS OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN RELATIONS TO STAFF PRODUCTIVITY IN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES IN AKWA IBOM STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.8

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	This article is important for academics and organizations because it is related to the assessment of work performance or employee work productivity, so it is considered important as a reference and development of employee quality both in academic and corporate environments.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The meaning of the title, especially performance and productivity, has similarities in assessment, namely that work results are expressed evenly, while performance and productivity indicators are not used as measures in assessment, making it difficult to translate as a statement of the relationship between performance and productivity, as variables. It is necessary to review the understanding of performance theory, performance assessment and performance measurement as well as understanding of staff (employee) productivity theory, measurements or indicators used, so that the research model described is clear because it is connected as hypothesis development through a conceptual framework model.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Quite good but needs to be made more concise and clear in the systematic flow of writing the abstract such as objectives, research design/methodology, results, implications and a maximum of 200 words for the abstract (if there is a limit of 250 words, just adjust it to the journal systematics)	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	You need to look at the templates provided by the publishing journal	
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	If you have additional reference suggestions, please indicate them in the review form. quite good but there are some references related to the web, some are not suitable because they don't go directly to the related article, such as on the web for example DOI: https://doi.org/10....so those who can access it directly You can open the reference article.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Improvements can be adjusted based on comments from paper reviewers.	
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Quite good and still acceptable	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It's best to read weighty/quality articles more often to make it easier to write papers for further study, thank you, hopefully it's useful and successful.	

Review Form 1.8

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:	Mochammad Munir Rachman
Department, University & Country	University of PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya, Indonesia