

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_118932
Title of the Manuscript:	EXPLORING THE IMPACT OF WORK-RELATED STRESS IN THE NIGERIAN PETROLEUM INDUSTRY
Type of the Article	Empirical – qualitative study

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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>For the analysis developed by the author seems superficial and lacking in originality</p> <p>In general it is in line with the paper content</p> <p>For the major part of the paper focuses on a detailed analysis of the methodology and data collection tools, rather than on an analysis of the research field and work environment of the selected business</p> <p>Is it correct but is barely acceptable for beginner researchers</p> <p>Are acceptable</p> <p>The topic analysed is relevant, but the author has failed to achieve the objectives for which he undertook this research, because he hasn't used appropriate tools to make the analysis of the data more accurate and valid. For the literature review is very short; the first part suffers from increased repetition of ideas without going into any depth of conceptual analysis</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Is correct	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It would be advisable to summarise the methodology section and give more attention to the field analysis section and clearly formulate the aspects generating the stress situation at company level as well as the nature of the economic and social impact for this company.</p> <p>It is to develop an analysis of the data collected using appropriate tools to get relevant results in consequence.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Toufah Najat
Department, University & Country	FSJES, Morocco