

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_89468
Title of the Manuscript:	Socio-Cultural Factors and Competencies of Senior Staff in Public Universities: The Hierarchical Mediation Role of Staff Satisfaction and Sense of Belonging
Type of the Article	Research paper

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

	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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. There are typos and grammatical mistakes throughout the manuscript that should be corrected;2. Double check the in-text citations;3. Based on the CFW as provided in Figure 1 is confusing. Although, the author has provided the supporting theory the hypothesis development is still not clear. According to the CFW, the author could formulate 14 hypotheses as I see through the arrows linking the predictors with the outcome. But only two hypotheses were formulated that need correction;4. Linking one predictor with DV need empirical support from the past related literature which is missing. This manuscript doesn't tell how these constructs were linked;5. The author must provide discussion with supporting previous literature for each variable to support the CFW;6. The results in Table 3 are not matching with the CFW- The CFW doesn't show the DV and parameters. Also, these are not parameters. The author should use the dimension or indicators.7. Also what type of sample techniques were used;8. In Table 2: explain what are the M, F, T, etc.9. As the author has conducted the pretesting, thus providing the scale reliability value before and after the actual survey. Could be better if provided both individual and integrated values;10. The revised model is incorrect and missing multiple values;11. Table 5 results are not comprehensible; several strange symbols have been used that need correction and more explanation;12. No need to write recommendations in the conclusion;13. Conclusion must be revised as it looks like a summary of this study;14. Instead of recommendation I would suggest that the author should provide implications in terms of theory, practicality, methodology, and social perspectives;15. Reference list consist of multiple errors and needs to be revised;16. Provide a questionnaire as an appendix for more understanding17. Correct the mistakes in the original manuscript. For reference I have highlighted a few yellow colours;	
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:	Asad Khan
Department, University & Country	University of Peshawar, Pakistan