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| PART 1: Review Comments |
| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This chapter contributes significantly to the field of organizational behavior, specifically in higher education. The study focuses on job insecurity, turnover intention, and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), areas that are understudied in academic settings. Its focus on an institution in Eastern Cape adds contextually relevant insights for South Africa, making the findings useful for both policymakers and academic leaders. However, the chapter could benefit from deeper engagement with recent literature on higher education HR challenges. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title is descriptive but a bit long. A concise alternative could be: *“Impact of Job Insecurity and Turnover Intentions on Organizational Citizenship Behavior in an Eastern Cape University.”* This version maintains clarity while being more compact. |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract provides a good overview of the study's objectives and findings. However, it can be improved by including some specific data points, such as key correlation values or sample demographics. This would enhance the abstract’s informativeness and align it with scientific communication standards. |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | The chapter follows a logical and coherent structure, with appropriate subsections. However, separating the findings and discussion would improve clarity. For example, discussing implications after each hypothesis test would add depth and readability to the conclusions. |  |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | The study is scientifically sound and employs multiple statistical tools (e.g., Pearson correlation, regression analysis) to validate its hypotheses. However, there are concerns about over-reliance on simple linear models. A more nuanced statistical analysis, such as path analysis or Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), could strengthen the results. Additionally, some concepts, like multicollinearity, could be better explained. |  |
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| The references are generally adequate but could benefit from the inclusion of more recent studies. For example, newer literature on employee engagement in higher education would align the findings with global trends. Some references are repeated excessively, such as Tokay and Eyupoglu (2018). Consider balancing the citations with broader sources. |  |
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| **Language and English Quality:** The language is generally clear, but there are minor grammatical errors (e.g., “severety” should be corrected to “severity”). Consistent use of terms such as “faculty” versus “department” is recommended for clarity. Additionally, some sentences are overly long and could be restructured for readability. |
| **Figures and Tables:** The figures and tables are helpful, but some could benefit from additional labels. For example, adding interpretation notes to correlation tables would assist non-expert readers. Ensure all figures maintain consistent formatting. The conceptual framework (Figure 1) should also be labeled more clearly. |
| **Methodology Details:** The methodology section is thorough but could be enhanced by explaining why alternative sampling techniques (e.g., stratified sampling) were not used. Additionally, a brief mention of ethical clearance procedures would add to the chapter’s transparency. |
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| Optional/General comments | Overall, the chapter provides valuable insights into organizational behavior, particularly in the underexplored context of higher education institutions in South Africa. While the methodology and analysis are solid, some sections—such as the discussion—could be more developed. Linking findings to broader policy recommendations would strengthen the impact of the research. Moreover, incorporating qualitative insights (e.g., interviews with staff) could enrich the study and make the findings more actionable.* **Strengths:**
	+ **The chapter addresses a relevant and underexplored topic by analyzing the effects of job insecurity and turnover intention on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in an academic setting.**
	+ **The research employs appropriate quantitative methods, with clear hypothesis testing and the use of multiple statistical tools.**
	+ **The findings are contextually valuable, especially for higher education institutions in South Africa, providing useful insights for HR management.**
* **Areas for Improvement:**
	+ **Statistical Analysis: A more advanced method, such as Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), could provide deeper insights.**
	+ **Writing and Language: Minor grammatical issues and long sentences need revision for clarity.**
	+ **Discussion and Policy Implications: The discussion section would benefit from stronger links to policy recommendations and broader academic debates.**
	+ **References: While the references are adequate, more recent studies should be included to enhance relevance.**
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