



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_48718
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing perceived prevalence of deception in Organizational Communication
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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>27-30: distortion, manipulation and deception are NOT synonymous. While the effect may be similar, please indicate that you are aware of the differences.</p> <p>61: You use McCornack's origin study in 1992; in 2014 he updated and you should recognize ideas that are not 20 years old.</p> <p>While your study (survey and analysis) is good, your lit review is antiquated.</p>	<p>Compulsory revision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Necessary alterations have been made to distinguish the three. See para 1,2 and 4. 2. The paper had not included McCornack 2014 work earlier as his later work deals primarily with production of deceptive messages while the current paper is oriented more towards analysis of prevalence of deception in organization along the four parameters which are basically in his original work done in 1992. However, his 2014 work is now been added as review and reference. 3. The literature review is antiquated because the present work is basically IMT theory based. There is dearth of literature on the theory. The ideas which are relevant to the theory although old, needed recognition for better inferences. <p>Minor Revision The paper is now consistent in its format.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	Some of your paragraphs are indented while some are just next lines. Which is it? Please be consistent.	
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)	