

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	<p>The submitted article was reviewed and studied. The following points are provided in relation to the article, which can be re-examined in case of major modifications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The article is weak in the research literature section and does not provide comprehensive literature on the subject. 2. The most important weakness of the submitted article is its research method. In the research method section, the regression analysis method has been used without statistically examining the reliability and validity of the questionnaires. 3. First, Cronbach's alpha reliability and composite reliability must be determined, and the calculation of convergent and divergent validity is necessary to examine the relationship of each of the sub-factors with the main structure and then the effect of the main factors on each other. 4. I suggest using the structural equation modeling method to increase the value of data analysis. 5. In the conclusion section, part of it should be related to the results of statistical analysis of data, which is not seen in the submitted article. <p>Finally, I would like to add that if these modifications are not made, the article will be rejected in my opinion</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammad Hossein Khasmafkan Nezam
Department, University & Country	University of Isfahan, Iran