

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_130025
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Driving Individual Performance: The Mediating Role of Innovation and Moderating Impact of Work-Life Balance among Indonesia's Professional Village Facilitators</b>
Type of the Article	Research

#### **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>

#### **PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This research contributes significantly to understanding how factors like job crafting, work integrity, and innovative work behavior influence the performance of community development professionals in Indonesia. The findings challenge some assumptions about these relationships and highlight the need for further research to understand how to best support and motivate these crucial professionals.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title effectively conveys the research's focus and is well-suited for academic purposes. It is concise and clearly states the main research question. It explicitly mentions the key variables: individual performance, innovation, and work-life balance. It highlights the specific context of Indonesian professional village facilitators, adding relevance and significance.	
<b>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.</b>	Yes, the abstract is well-written and provides a clear study overview. However, adding a sentence or two about the implications should strengthen it.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	Yes, but there are some points to consider. For example, using "saturation sampling" in a quantitative study with 203 participants is unusual. Saturation sampling is typically used in qualitative research.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	More citations are needed in the introduction and methodology to support statements.	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Some sentences are unnecessarily long and complex, making them difficult to read and understand. Occasional awkward phrasing or word choices can be found, which may not be the most natural or precise way to express the ideas. Some phrases could be more concise and impactful. Minor grammatical errors, such as incorrect verb tenses, article usage, and punctuation, are present.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The introduction could be made more specific by defining key terms like "self-reliant villages" and "village development index" more precisely. The introduction could benefit from smoother transitions between paragraphs, particularly where new concepts or subtopics are introduced. The literature review could benefit from better organization and flow. Using headings and subheadings and ensuring smooth transitions between paragraphs would enhance readability and clarity. A stronger link between the literature and the hypotheses is needed. More information on the assessment of reliability (e.g., Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability), validity (e.g., AVE, Fornell-Larcker criterion), and model fit (e.g., SRMR, GoF) would strengthen the scientific rigor. A more in-depth discussion of the possible reasons for these unexpected results is needed. More specific and actionable recommendations tailored to the study findings would be more impactful.</p> <p><b>The study addresses a timely and important topic by focusing on the factors that influence the performance of village facilitators, who play a crucial role in community development. The manuscript clearly outlines the research objectives, hypotheses, and methodology, making it easy to follow the study's logic and findings. The use of psychological contract theory provides a relevant lens for understanding the relationships between the variables under investigation. The literature review provides a good overview of previous research on job crafting, work integrity, innovative work behavior, and individual performance.</b></p> <p><b>However, there are some points to consider. For example, Improve the organization and flow of the literature review. Ensure the references are up-to-date and relevant to the specific research focus. Strengthen the link between the literature and the hypotheses. Clarify the sampling method and provide a justification for its use. Provide more details on the data analysis procedures and the specific criteria used to evaluate the model. Further discuss on the unexpected negative effect of IWB on individual performance. Develop more specific and actionable practical implications. Lastly, improve clarity, conciseness, and grammatical accuracy throughout the manuscript.</b></p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Akaraphun Ratasuk</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Panyapiwat Institute of Management, Thailand</b></p>