



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_12098
Title of the Manuscript:	Work Stress and Job Performance in Malaysia Academic Sector: Role of Social Support as Moderator
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	It is a very valuable study with interesting findings. The following comments will help bring the article into its final format 1. Many sentences need to be revised for the language. For example, lines 18, 24 and 28 are not clear and in line 35 what does "they" stand for 2. Please do not add the reference number and continue your sentence as in line 57. It could be re-worded for instance by stating "a study revealed..... and then adding the reference number. The way sentences are written are very confusing to follow 3. Very few studies were reviewed or mentioned in the literature review section regarding the causes of job stress and effect on job performance in universities 4. Ethical issues are not referred to 5. What are the inferences of having a mean of 3.15 or 3.59 and does it make any difference whether it is high or low or more or less than 3 6. Please also present results by starting with the general to the specific i.e. from the background information about age, gender, education etc.. to the job stress and social support 7. Although not one of the objectives, it would be interesting to know if there had been significant differences between employees with different age and education levels 8. Were the questionnaires tested for understanding i.e. pretested	I already correct the sentences to make it more clear. Corrected with change the reference number not in the first line of sentences. Job stress variable already eliminated from the research paper. Ethical issues not mention in this research. The mean mentioned just for showed the number of means for the variable since its not showing any differences I already take out the mean from the sentences. I already add some information regarding this suggestion.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	9. In Table 3, a legend was included but the information is not supported by the contents of the table. The legend contains P value but this information is not presented in the table itself	Questionnaire just distributed without pretested once since the questionnaire written in both English and Malay language so employees able to understand. The P-value in Table actually refers to p , already corrected it in Table.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		