

Paper: “Social Media Dependency and Work-Related Attitudes with Religiosity Mediation”

Submitted: 19 November 2021

Accepted: 02 March 2022

Published: 31 March 2022

Corresponding Author: Muhammad Hasmi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n10p10](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n10p10)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Arlinda Ymeraj
European University of Tirana, Albania

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)

The title is adequate - descriptive of the topic of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)



The abstract is well structured with all the appropriate stages of investigation.

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

(Please insert your comments)

p. 2. - "...the poor performance of the employee; and poor achievement of profits..."
- ...the poor performance of the employee, and poor achievement of profits...


p.11 - "Last but not least, the information on the mediator of religiosity..." - ...
Finally, the information on the mediator of religiosity...

p.12 - "...Total co-worker social media connections was not related to either organizational support or organizational spontaneity." - ...connections were not related...

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)



Yes

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

well-structured article.

- introduction

- literature review

- hypothesis - (4 hypotheses + H5)

- methodology

- data analysis

- discussion and conclusion

- references

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

yes it has the sufficient conclusions
for the presented work.

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)

all citations
are in the references / bibliography.

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):

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)

The title is clear, however it is a bit long. It is suggested to authors to make it shorter.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. It is developed in a concise way, respecting all the rules.

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


(Please insert your comments)

There are very few errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)



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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The body of paper is very clear and does not contain errors, with very few and minor comments.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion is drawn in a clear manner, fully supported by the findings and the arguments, shared in the paper.

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)

The list of references is comprehensive and almost appropriate, with very few exceptions, which does not de-value the article.

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):

Although social media is a well explored topic, the authors' point of view is totally a novelty. The key issue is addressed in a simple and at the same time, a thorough way. Arguments are put forward in a clear and convincing matter. There are very few comments, already mentioned in the article, which may be revised by the authors.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: