

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_88036
Title of the Manuscript:	Hybrid Working Model: A pathway to Success or Failure
Type of the Article	Case 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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

### **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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	This article is researched poorly and requires major revisions for it to be worth publishing. Editing is very poor with many grammatical mistakes noted. What is the research method used here and justification for the same, is missing? There is no explanation of the research method at all, zero – what is it, how does it work in practice, pros and cons of it and what to do about its shortfalls or disadvantages? What is the theoretical and conceptual framework driving this research? What are the variables in this research? Where are validity and reliability issues addressed? I would like the author(s) to have more latest journal citations on the topic so that the article is at the frontier of latest developments and knowledge. The theoretical perspectives and framework are very weak which defeats the purpose of any academic paper. That would help refine findings and credibility. It is important to highlight global best practices in hybrid working. I would want to see comprehensive latest journal citations reports from across the world quoted here for checks and balances and maintenance of expected academic standards. Where are suggestions for future research here? This paper must address the conventional sections of any acceptable research paper and not be written like a newspaper article (have: Keywords, Introduction and Background, Problem Statement, Aims & Objectives, Research Questions, Research Methodology, Findings and Discussions, Conclusions, Future Research, References. If no major revisions are done it should be rejected. And any major revisions are done it must then be subject to peer review again for standards and credibility. The paper is well below standard academic paper for journals.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Editing and grammatical mistakes.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	n/a	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Faustino Taderera</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National University of Science &amp; Technology, Oman</b>