

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_87202
Title of the Manuscript:	ROLE OF DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS IN RELATIONSHIP WITH HIGH PERFORMANCE WORK SYSTEM
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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Overall comment            The organization and discussion could be improved quite a bit, to make it clearer in some places to demonstrate symbolic role. The article lacks proper balance between context, research, discussion, analysis and synthesis</p> <p>The relevant arguments are scarcely related together and there is lack of analysis and synthesis. The difficulty with it is that it does not develop a clearly expressed work. Justification of these countries used as references China, South Africa and Turkey</p> <p>The difficulty here is the lack of a clear central point, discuss and apply the details you include and you'll have a great paper.</p> <p>The author obviously has the ability to write clear prose, but mechanical errors obscure the meaning and reduce the credibility.</p> <p>The author should have discussed the issues and the issues of the study in details and how the issues were not resolved or partially resolved by previous studies.            No bullet points            Need more current academic citation to support all the relevant issues.</p> <p>Introduction            Overall argument may not be fully developed or consistent in its application            Lacks research topic or problem not clearly stated shown to be worth investigating            Appropriate background information has not been provided with special terms and concepts defined.            State clearly the objectives of the study and why this study is very significant to the specific country and why is it compared to these 3 countries, are they the major trading partners            There is some mention of relevant literature, but this outline is very patchy, unclear, and/or very inadequately placed in context.            A few points from the literature are brought out, but there are major gaps, misunderstandings, and no grasp of detail or subtlety            Have a heading of literature review and discuss the gaps as well as the variables of the study and any theories that supports the study</p> <p>Literature review is totally lacking rigorous explanation</p> <p>Methodology            Detail explanation of research methodology is required of why triangulation method was chosen            Explain types of data has been utilized in your study in types and sources data section and the significant of the chosen years of the data            Explain in detail the terms of independent variables and how these independent variables were chosen            What is the impact of independent variable to dependent variable and how the theory able to co relate the relationship?            Is the population know or unknown to justify the types of sampling used            Population and sample characteristics            What scales has been used nominal, internal, ordinal etc. for primary data            How the primary data has been retrieved and the significance of the sources            Explain the purpose and the significance of having both primary and secondary data            Unable to reveal the research methods fully described of the advantages and disadvantages of chosen methods that was discussed.            Research instruments not well designed with all questions etc. relevant to research objectives.            Lack of evidence of care and accuracy in the data collection process</p> <p>Analysis            Ensure all the analysis need the original spss tabulated table in appendix            What about reliability analysis            Incorporate mean variance and std deviation analysis to show the skewness of the data            Anova and other analysis that will strengthen the analysis            The organization and discussion could be improved quite a bit, to make it clearer in some places to demonstrate symbolic role            Need more analysis to support the data as well as the hypothesis            Explanation of tables should be in detail to statically analysis the literature review and the theoretical part.            All tables need detail explanation of the effects towards the study.            Many analysis that needs to be conducted to ensure no data discrepancies</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<p>Discussion</p> <p>The organization and discussion could be improved quite a bit, to make it clearer in some places to demonstrate symbolic role</p> <p>Need more analysis to support the data as well as the hypothesis</p> <p>Explanation of tables should be in detail to statically analysis the literature review and the theoretical part.</p> <p>All tables need detail explanation of the effects towards the study.</p> <p>Discussion is too vague and some of the points need to be stressed and provide clear evidence why such variables have been significant for the study</p> <p>Discuss the impact of the analysis and whether it links to research objectives and analytical perspective</p> <p>Finding of the research has not been compared and contrasted with findings, models and concepts derived from the literature review</p> <p>Recommendations discussed in context which are not widely applicable</p> <p>Relevance of the conclusions for stakeholders has not been discussed</p> <p>Limitations and further recommended research need to be explained in paragraph format</p> <p>Lack of current academic references</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sanmugam Annamalah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>SEGI University College, Malaysia</b>