



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_63612
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors affecting perceived overall job satisfaction: An exploratory analysis on public bank employees of Bangladesh
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The presentation of the paper is understandable and easy to follow. The study focusses only in 2 cities, it might be misleading if we take the result as a whole; it might be elaborated further on the scope or limitations for justification. Revisit the consistency of the format in presenting your references. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revisit the consistency of the tenses used in paper especially on the abstract. Read again some words used on the paper, e.g Introduction on last paragraph... <i>following</i> research question (only 1 RQ). On research methodology, 4,00,000 bank employees in Bangladesh (but in <i>two big cities</i>),.... <i>interviewed in different cities on Bangladesh</i> Your own elaborated model, it is better to called it conceptual framework; the table 1 is where the theories came from. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally, the paper is HIGHLY acceptable for publication in the journal. One of the reasons for conducting research is to recommend plan of action on the problem identified; it is better to separate your conclusion and recommendation. Kindly highlight the recommendations of your research. 	

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:	Roel D. Juevesa
Department, University & Country	Ramon Magsaysay Memorial Colleges, Philippines