

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_80237
Title of the Manuscript:	Working Away from Home, Coping Strategies, Quality of Working Life, Well-being and Performance
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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Clear expression of why this study is important. ➤ Clear articulation of how the study will be conducted. ➤ Study results displayed in a logical and concise manner. ➤ What makes for successful and satisfying working away from home is a worthy topic. <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The finding regarding the positive association between working-away strategies and negative outcomes (i.e., stress) is not fully addressed. This finding is counter-intuitive and as such necessitates more consideration than the one or two sentences the author gives to it. The Discussion section, where future research is considered, is the perfect place for the author to offer insights into how this unexpected, counter-intuitive association may be tested to help determine what is happening here (the author needs to offer thoughts on how future research might address this). ➤ The full survey, at a minimum the survey questions used in the analysis, should be displayed in the manuscript, rather than sending the reader to a link. Some readers might prefer to access as few links as possible (due to omnipresent malware and virus threats). Also, what happens if the link malfunctions? The survey questions are a crucial component of the study and should be included in the manuscript (again, at least those questions used in the analysis). Accessed in Research Gate, the survey is not overly long and should not add too much length to the manuscript (of, course, can leave the copy in RG). In my opinion, to send the reader to a link to access relevant survey questions is bad optics and bad practice. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>This is a solid, nicely written and presented study, and the author should be able to readily address both of the above-listed concerns.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	James Vanderleeuw
Department, University & Country	Park University, USA