Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEBA_89413**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A Study on the Layoff in Oil Service Company in Oman and its Impact on Employees**
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.journalajeba.com/index.php/AJEBA/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	Lacks research topic or problem not clearly stated shown to be worth investigating. Quite a number os studies has been conducted on Impact of Employees Layoff in the Oil and Gas industry, what is new in this study , explain the GAP Appropriate background information has not been provided with special terms and concepts defined. The author should have discussed the issues in detail and how the issues were not resolved or partially resolved by previous studies. Discuss the important recent extensions that have been made to the model to make it more realistic and give a brief overview of some of the older and more recent empirical studies that have fitted the model. Such contributions adds up the value of the paper Presents an overall argument, but may not be fully developed or consistent in its application Lacks research topic or problem not clearly stated shown to be worth investigating Have a separate sub headings in literature reviewfor all the variables Literature review need detailed explanation and the gaps as well the theory to show the relationship between IVs and DV. Include the hypothesis to show the relationships at the end of every explanation of a variable Detail explanation of research methodology is required of why triangulation method was chosen Explain types of data has been utilized in your study in types and sources data section and the significant of the chosen years of the data Explain in detail the terms of independent variables and how these independent variables were chosen Conceptual framework is confusing Make sure conceptual framework is clearly drawn and these variables need detailed explanation in the literature review What is the impact of independent variable to dependent variable and how the theory able to co relate the relationship? Is the population know or unknown to justify the types of sampling used What scales has been used nominal, internal, ordinal etc. for primary data How the secondary data has been retrieved and the significance of the sources Explain the purpose and the significance of having both primary and secondary data Unable to reveal the research methods fully described of the advantages and disadvantages of chosen methods that was discussed. Research instruments not well designed with all questions etc. relevant to research objectives. Lack of evidence of care and accuracy in the data collection process The organization and discussion could be improved quite a bit, to make it clearer in some places to demonstrate symbolic role Pilot test reliability and validity analysis Need more analysis to support the data as well as the hypothesis Explanation of tables should be in detail to statically analysis the literature review and the theoretical part. All tables need detail explanation of the effects towards the study. Finding of the research need to be compared and contrasted with findings, theories, models and concepts derived from the literature review. Conclusions and recommendations discussed in context which are widely applicable Relevance of the conclusions for stakeholders need to be discussed Need more academic references Limitations of the research need to be incorporated	

	Literature review has only 2 hypotheses but in analysis too many hypothesis How do these hypotheses are justified?	
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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Sanmugam Annamalah**
Department, University & Country	**SEGI University College, Malaysia**