



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_34985
Title of the Manuscript:	The Square of PERcieved ACtion model (SPEAC model) applied in Digital Ethnography for Work Activity Analysis: Performance and Workers' Perception
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>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Dear author(s), This is an interesting research article. However, several questions were arise and suggestions were provided in order to enhance the quality of the paper as follows: 1. The problem statement is less clear and could be more useful if the author(s) come up with more sources to justify. 2. Why mentioned methods are more useful compared to conventional methods? Despite efficiency? 3. What is Digital Ethnography? Please explain more details about the background and its functions? (Line 32 & 33). I knew few sources have mentioned in the paper to clarify this method however it is not sufficient. 4. Line 34, the line "the protocol was tested...." (please provide the source). 5. Line 40-44 the sentences are not smooth and might be confused the readers please rewrite or make simples sentences. 6. Highlight the contributions to the existing body of knowledge and methodological contribution. 7. Future research suggestions? 8. Font is not consistent throughout the paper. 9. Style of references is not consistent. Best wishes.	1. Correction done with additional reference and additional arguments. 2. Details are provided in § 4.1 and 5. 3. Comments and Refs are added in §1. 4. Refs added. 5. Paragraph revised. 6. Additional details are given in §2.3. 7. Additional comments are provided in § "Conclusions". 8. Correction done. 9. Correction done. Thanks a lot.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		