

Manuscript: “**High-Performance Work System & Employee Performance in Public Sector: Testing the Mediating Effect of Job Engagement**”

Submitted: 28 February 2021

Accepted: 21 April 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Saba Feroz Qureshi

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n12p129

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Khawaja Tauseef Tasneem, Assistant Professor

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, the title is clear.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract is well written. It clearly states the purpose of the study, methodology and the results. Abstract is motivating enough to grab the attention of the reader.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

In my opinion, the paper is well written and contributes to the existing knowledge. I could not find any grammatical errors in the presentation and the approaches used.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The methodology chosen is adequate and the author did a good job discussing

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The paper is generally well structured, ideas are clear and the writing is concise and argumentative. Logical approach of the paper is sound. Overall, the research represents valuable information. The literature review is comprehensive and the author managed to successfully discuss the importance of the research. Factual statements are supported by evidence.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

This is an interesting study and the authors have collected a unique dataset from public sector. I found the conclusion is interesting. It is comprehensive and objective.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Recent and relevant citations have been used in the research. Bibliography is sufficient to justify the research.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):