

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_128256
Title of the Manuscript:	EXPLORING MOONLIGHTING MOTIVATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONAL DYNAMICS AMONG INDIAN IT PROFESSIONALS
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: 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 because it has deeper case study on moonlighting intentions in the Indian IT industry. Moonlighting, which is described as working more than one's primary job, is a common occurrence in modern workplaces, especially in industries like information technology (IT), where flexible work schedules and a wide range of career options are abundant.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes, abstract of the article is comprehensive	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, manuscript is scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, references are sufficient.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language quality is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	The current research highlights the wider ramifications of moonlighting for workforce management procedures and career development strategies, offering insightful information about how it affects people's career decisions and organizational perspectives.	

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:	Vishal Reddy Vadiyala
Department, University & Country	USA