



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_53974
Title of the Manuscript:	ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION AND PROACTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR AS PREDICTORS OF CYBER-LOAFING AMONG ANAMBRA STATE CIVIL SERVANTS
Type of the 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>)



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. Citations are not necessary in ABSTRACT: here you state what did, how you did it (Materials and Method(s)), your results and what was learnt, and how your work contributes to the body of knowledge in this field.</p> <p>2. Author(s) is confused about the use of American English and British English. E.g., organization (American word), and behaviour (British word). For a good paper, one style of writing should be maintained. Check through the work and maintain one English style of writing.</p> <p>3. Remove Review of Literature. In a technical paper of this kind, you can restructure the paper as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Title ii. Abstract iii. Introduction iv. Materials and Method(s) v. Results and Discussions (This should be supported with recent (or current) citations. vi. Conclusion (rewrite the abstract after conclusion to capture the highlights of the work) vii. Recommendations (itemise your recommendations for the understanding the reading public). <p>4. The study is well-researched and it contains what is required as a good paper. However, author(s) should reorganised the paper as recommended in (3) above.</p> <p>5. References: Very ok.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. The word internet, if used alone should written as Internet. E.g., The reach of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) especially the internet has mixed outcomes for both private and public organizations alike</p>	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jackson Akpojaro
Department, University & Country	University of Africa, Nigeria