

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJAEES_118182
Title of the Manuscript:	Emotional labour and work performance
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.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This manuscript has its significant importance in the field of social science as it is contributing to upgrade the literature related to emotional labour and work performance.</p> <p>2. The title of this article is suitable but researcher may use an elaborative and comprehensive research title</p> <p>3. The abstract of this article is very comprehensive and elaborative, that shows the researcher grip on the research area.</p> <p>4. Researcher articulate the study section and sub section in an elaborative and inclusive way, which strengthen the connectivity of the different section of this research article</p> <p>5. Ofcourse this research study is scientifically correct which filled the literature, methodological gap and suggest important points to help the researchers in the future</p> <p>6. There is a need to add some recent studies in the script and references in reference section</p> <p>6.1: There is a dare need to revisit the incite references as they are not according to the required referencing style.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes language and English quality of article is appropriate and acceptable for the sack of publication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Ghazanafar Hussain
Department, University & Country	University of the Punjab, India