

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJEBA_129374 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Perceived Discrimination and the Effect on Job Satisfaction: Study on Employees with Disability |
| Type of the Article | Original Research 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it explores the impact of workplace discrimination on job satisfaction among employees with disabilities. It highlights the varying experiences of individuals with different impairments and underscores the role of perceived discrimination in predicting job satisfaction. The findings provide valuable insights for fostering inclusive and equitable work environments. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | It can be more suitable if title will be, "The Impact of Perceived Discrimination on the job satisfaction among Employees with Disability: A study of Baking Sector". | |
| 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 provides a concise summary, including the research objectives, methodology, key findings, and notable limitations. It is satisfactory. | |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | Overall, the manuscript is scientifically correct but in each session of article is appropriate. The study addresses a significant and underexplored area in workplace dynamics, especially focusing on employees with disabilities. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | List any sources cited in the review article, follow the appropriate citation guidelines (e.g., APA, MLA). Provide specific examples or evidence from the research article to support your evaluation and critique. Previous five years references should be mentioned. It was found that local context literature was ignored. | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Maintain an objective and professional tone throughout the review. Ensure that the review follows a logical flow and is organized in a clear and concise manner. Use clear and precise language, avoiding jargon or technical terms that may be unfamiliar to the reader. | |
| Optional/General comments | Overall, the topic and article is good but needs improvement in methodology and discussion part of the study. In literature review no appropriate theoretical background was given. Overall suggestions: In the introduction section the local context references were not used to describe the research gap effectively. National and international research studies should be incorporated simultaneously. The methodology employed—convenience sampling and questionnaire-based data collection—is appropriate for the study's objectives. However, there are potential limitations with convenience sampling, such as sample bias, that could affect the generalizability of the results. A more robust sampling method, such as stratified or random sampling, would enhance the study's validity. Additionally, more information on the questionnaire's design, reliability, and validity would improve transparency. Research design should be cleared. In the discussion section there is need to focus on interpreting the findings considering the research objectives and relevant literature. Discuss the implications of the results for theory, practice, or policy. Furthermore, the discussion section should interpret the results in the context of existing literature and theoretical frameworks. | |

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: | Lubna Oad |
| Department, University & Country | Benazir Bhutto Shaheed University Lyari, Pakistan |