

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_87804
Title of the Manuscript:	Workplace Bullying Against Certified Registered Anaesthetists in the Tamale Metropolis in the Northern Region of Ghana
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/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	The theme approached in this article falls into the topic of <b>Asian Research Journal of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</b> . The sections of the article allow the presentation and clarification of the analyzed issues. The paper has a clarity of informations. There is a logic thread of the presentation. The used language is scientifically correct, and it can be read and understood by the specialists. The style and expression of the authors are clear and coherent, no expression mistakes. The article contains 67 bibliographical sources in <b>References</b> . The most recent sources are from 2020, and the oldest source is from 1996. The works published in the last ten years are predominant. The citation of the bibliographical sources is made according to requirements.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The general term "performance" alone cannot be a keyword for the paper. In the subchapter 2.3 <b>Data Analysis</b> it is necessary to write "excel" in capital letters, as a trademark of Microsoft Corp. The triplet "3.4.1" should not be written in bold. There are certain inconsistencies in the technical editing of the paper. There is no free space between the titles of all chapters and / or subchapters and the text that begins. The chapter <b>Conclusion</b> must be numbered by 5. The indentation of writing works in <b>References</b> is not permanently observed. There are certain unwanted free spaces in the content of the text related to certain bibliographic sources.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Blajina Ovidiu
Department, University & Country	University Politehnica of Bucharest, Romania