

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_129622
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Work Environment, Compensation, and Leadership on Job Satisfaction through Work Motivation as a Mediating Variable
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Review Comments on the Paper Titled: The Effect of Work Environment, Compensation, and Leadership on Job Satisfaction through Work Motivation as a Mediating Variable</p> <p>Areas for Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The abstract is informative but overly dense. Simplifying technical jargon and ensuring it highlights key findings, and succinct practical implications can improve readability. > The introduction could benefit from a sharper focus. While it provides sufficient background, the connection between high employee turnover and the research variables (work environment, compensation, leadership) can be more explicitly stated. > The literature review is comprehensive but sometimes repetitive. Several points, such as the relationship between leadership and job satisfaction, are revisited multiple times without adding new insights. > The references cited lack a balanced presentation of contradictory findings. Including a critical analysis of conflicting studies would enrich the discussion. > While the hypotheses are well-grounded, the language is inconsistent. For instance, H4 ("Work motivation has a negative and insignificant effect on job satisfaction") seems to contradict the general theme of the study, which posits a positive relationship between motivation and satisfaction. > The sampling technique is described as purposive, yet there is no justification for why this method was chosen. A brief discussion of its appropriateness would strengthen the section. > While the study uses Smart-PLS, the rationale for choosing this tool over others (e.g., SEM or AMOS) is not provided. > The discussion section occasionally reiterates results without offering deeper interpretation or linking back to the theoretical framework. > The implications of leadership having no significant impact on work motivation are not fully explored, especially since this contradicts prior research and the theoretical model. <p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Avoid redundancies in the literature review and discussion sections. A focused narrative will improve engagement. > Use simpler language, especially in technical sections like methodology and statistical analysis. > Summarize key points in bullet points or concise paragraphs for better readability. > Delve deeper into why leadership had an insignificant effect on motivation. This could lead to valuable theoretical contributions or practical advice for managers. > Provide a brief narrative for each figure or table, explaining its relevance to the study's objectives and findings. <p>Reviewer Remarks for the Editor. Overall, this article provides valuable insights into work environment dynamics, compensation, leadership, and their interplay with job satisfaction and motivation. By addressing the above suggestions, the research can achieve greater clarity, coherence, and impact, making it</p>	

Review Form 3

	a more compelling contribution to the field. My recommendation is to Accept the paper, provided the authors address the suggested revisions effectively.	
--	---	--

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Saqib Altaf
Department, University & Country	School of Management, Jiangsu University, China