

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_88082
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on the factors influencing employee motivation and its impact on job performance in Higher Education Institutions in Sultanate of Oman
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.journalajl2c.com/index.php/AJL2C/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	<p>The entirety of the manuscript conforms to the standard of a quality journal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">In the “ABSTRACT,” please highlight the research design employed in the study.In the “Introduction” section, although they're a lot of researchers who have conducted a similar study this does not prevent you from doing the same provided you have established the uniqueness of your study.In the Literature Review, discuss how this literature cited bears importance to the present study conducted, why this has been chosen, and provide a clinching statementIn the Research Methodology, please establish as to how the questionnaire was validated.In the Results and Discussion, the Tables and Figures presented must be supported with literature and implications, not just a mere presentation.Provide suggestions for policy recommendations.	<p>Agree with the reviewer. Modifications made and highlighted in yellow.</p> <p>Agree. No change is made as this is taken as a valuable comment and advice. Moreover uniqueness of the study is already explained in the research gap.</p> <p>Agree. Modification is done and highlighted in yellw in the literature review . Details of model is explained and included in Fig and it was already tested in the regression analysis.</p> <p>Agree. Modification is done by adding a sentence to make the already mentioned details on reliability test complete. Modification is highlighted in yellow.</p> <p>Disagree. The same is already explained in the last paragraph of research and discussion. (Before the findings of the study) . Hence, no changes are made to this effect.</p> <p>No changes made. The same is already given with respect to what could be possibly done in the institution.</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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No ethical issues. Informed consent from participants were obtained.