



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_36123
Title of the Manuscript:	An Empirical Study of Stress and Stress Management among Faculties of Private Technical Institutions in Meerut District
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Looking at the topic and objectives of the study, I suggest the literature review to be beefed up and re-written to reflect the objectives of the study. I suggest author(s) write the literature in sub-topics or paragraphs in the following manner.... 1. What is stress (work/job stress) 2. Causes of stress (particularly among faculty) 3. Effects of stress on faculty 4. Coping or management of stress Since the author(s) did not do any analysis on stress/demographics (particularly gender), I don't see the relevance of reviewing literature on it. With respect to the methodology, the author(s) employ the descriptive research design. Author(s) should briefly indicate what this design is and why it was employed.	I agree with Reviewer's comment and incorporated the corrections suggested by the learned Reviewer. He has given very positive and constructive comments. Thank you very much for pointing out the many shortcomings.
Minor REVISION comments	Introduction On line 6 of the introduction, author(s) should replace are with one... (in its absence, are lacks the 'edge' necessary for peak performance) to make the sentence more meaningful. 1.1 Stress at Workplace On line 5 under 1.1 the statement "Occupational stress and its effect have been among the most people" is not very clear. Maybe, the article "the" could be removed. Replace if on line 7 with of and put a full stop at the end of the reference [2]. Delete because and start the new sentence with stress. In view of this, the new sentence could read: <i>Occupational stress and its effect have been among most people as well as lead to thickening and hardening of the heart muscle, resulting in cardiovascular disease [2]. Stress is becoming a major contributor to absenteeism, low employee morale and high turnover rates. The cost of these stress consequence has become huge burden on many organization [3].</i> 1.2 Stress in Teaching Profession What is the importance of the quote from Fisher (1992)? Author(s) should either remove it or draw a link between what Fisher (1992) said and what others have posited. <i>The sentence could read: Teaching profession was recognised as low level stress occupation. However, studies indicate the contrary. For instance, Kyriacou (1980) reported ...</i> In this case: the sentence should be removed: Many	I agree with Reviewer's comment and incorporated the corrections suggested by the learned Reviewer. He has given very positive and constructive comments. Thank you very much for pointing out the many shortcomings.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	researchers were conducted on stress among faculties. OR Delete the first sentence [(Teaching profession was recognized as low stress occupation (Fisher, 1992))] And let the new sentence begin with Many researchers were conducted on stress among faculties. *** if author(s) preferred this option, the word “were” should be replaced with “have been” On line 8 (2nd paragraph), the word it should be deleted	
Optional/General comments	The paper is a good paper. However, the author(s) should effect the changes outlined above.	I feel very constructive comments as desired by the learned reviewer.