

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_83090
Title of the Manuscript:	Personal Life, Working Time and Job Stress on Employees' Performance in Select Nigerian Banks.
Type of the 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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Congratulations to the author(s) for their paper. The paper explores that the effort was made to investigate the influence of three variables of work-life balance namely personal life, working time and job stress on employees' performance in select Nigerian banks and concluded that work-life balance variables relate to and have influence on workers performance in Nigerian banks.</p> <p>The topic of the manuscript is very relevant and in line with the aims and scope of the journal which makes this manuscript interesting. However, I have some minor concerns that need to be addressed. I'll explain them in the order of importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Tables are structural forms with rows and columns. For this reason, shape and table separation should be done well.</li> <li>2) The novel contribution of the manuscript shall be made clear in the introduction. What does the paper adds to international literature?</li> <li>3) General statements shall be removed.</li> <li>4) The adopted methodology shall be described. All methods used, assumptions made shall be justified.</li> <li>5) Conclusions shall be specific and connected to your analysis of previous sections.</li> <li>6) The English are very weak. There is a need for English Editing.</li> <li>7) In my opinion, the policy recommendations do not have justification in the empirical results.</li> <li>8) Please clearly highlight the literature gap this study tries to fill in.</li> <li>9) It should be explained more clearly why 21 bank branches with a population of 401 bankers are especially preferred.</li> <li>10) Why the method used was chosen. You explained in the conclusion but it should be explained in detail before conclusion. How this method is essential to address limitations in this area? Please justify on why multiple regression analysis modeling is the most appropriate method for examining the selected thematic.</li> <li>11) And lastly, the writing needs to better. Although there are not a lot of obvious mistakes, the style is clunky and I advise that the manuscript is proffered by a native English speaker.</li> </ol>	

[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>Mustafa Göktuğ Kaya</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>KTO Karatay University, Turkey</b>