



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_48670</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Fun Culture @ Work Place: A Review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Conceptual</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Overall the manuscript is acceptable. However, few issues need to be addressed before final publication namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Required <b>proof read</b>.</li> <li>2) Citation for 2<sup>nd</sup> para, line 23.</li> <li>3) To update with <b>more recent citation</b> especially in the introduction section.</li> <li>4) Few <b>incomplete citations and missing references</b> such as Plato (year) – line 29 &amp; Weinstern (year?)- line 31. It is good to have a detail citation for Bible and Talmud as well.</li> <li>5) Line 32, “ Studies suggest that.....” , Line 34, “Such studies posit....” – which studies, please cite.</li> <li>6) Line 42- Cited work for “Recent literature indicates.....(Belkin, 2007), Please update to the recent citation, 12 years back citation seems not too recent.</li> <li>7) Line 62 to 64, please provide citation.</li> <li>8) Sentence on line 64, who said that? On what basis the classification of fun were grouped? Please cite.</li> <li>9) Who conclude the consequences of fun (line 68). Please cite some authors to reflect the review were made in this issue.</li> <li>10) First para in workplace fun section (line 74 to 79) is referring to previous study and the current state of “fun” studies. Thus, author(s) need citation of few scholars here to avoid ‘strong statement’.</li> <li>11) On what basis elements of fun were concluded? (line 85 to 86)</li> <li>12) Any citation for line 87 and 88? – “any social, interpersonal, .....enjoyment or pleasure” (Author(s)’s name, year: pg no). please cite accordingly.</li> <li>13) Be specific, indicate the table label clearly. Which table are you referring to? Line 91.</li> <li>14) Any citation for line 95 &amp; 96 sentence?</li> <li>15) Authors’ name cited in the Table 1 should come with year. E.g. Forel (2000)....</li> <li>16) Please explain on how the classification of official and organic were made (Table 1).</li> <li>17) Whose definition of workplace fun is referred to? Please cite (line 101)</li> <li>18) Typo for word “environment” and “show” line 116.</li> <li>19) Typo for work “ environment” and “scenario” line 119.</li> <li>20) To revise sentence line 188.</li> <li>21) To check the format of citation accordingly, especially, when to use “et. al” when to use full name citation. Refer to line 111 vs line 196 vs line 141. What is the exact year? 2003 or 2005? The citation also not in the reference list. Authors need to thoroughly check reference list as too many names cited in text which are not listed in references list.</li> <li>22) Too many direct quotations in text. Authors are suggested to paraphrase the statements.</li> <li>23) This study review all the work pertaining fun at work. However, it is more on summary. Authors need to review, critics and synthesize it to add more meaning to this article.</li> <li>24) Authors need to add conclusion section by discussing the concluding remarks of all the review made from the previous sections.</li> </ol>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b>Optional/General</b> comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Hasnizam Shaari</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Universiti Utara Malaysia Malaysia</i></b>