

**Review Form 3**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JEMT_129913  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Optimizing Operational Efficiency: A Case Study of Attitudinal, Stress, and Performance Factors in Security Personnel |
| Type of the Article      |   |

**General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>  
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

|  | Reviewer's comment  | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|--|---|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | This manuscript is valuable for the scientific community as it addresses the critical factors influencing operational efficiency within the security sector, an area with both practical and theoretical implications. The focus on attitudinal, stress, and performance factors provides a nuanced understanding of workforce dynamics. These insights can inform organizational policies, improve job performance, and enhance employee well-being in high-pressure environments. |   |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)   | The current title, " <b>Optimizing Operational Efficiency: A Case Study of Attitudinal, Stress, and Performance Factors in Security Personnel</b> ", is informative but could be refined for clarity and impact. An alternative suggestion: " <b>Enhancing Security Workforce Efficiency: Investigating Stress, Attitudes, and Performance Dynamics.</b> "  | Title revised   |
| 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.      | <p>The abstract is fairly comprehensive but could benefit from additional specificity. Consider including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The primary findings or conclusions of the study.</li><li>Specific methodologies used in the case study.</li><li>Implications for industry practices or future research.</li></ul> <p>This would provide readers with a clearer overview of the manuscript's scope and contributions</p>                                       | <p>Noted and effected</p> <p>Revised</p>  |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.  | The manuscript appears scientifically sound, but a detailed review of its methodology and data analysis sections is necessary to confirm its rigor. The inclusion of comparative data or benchmarking with similar studies could strengthen its conclusions.  | Noted   |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.                              | The references appear relevant but should be reviewed to ensure they are sufficiently recent and comprehensive. If not already included, consider citing recent studies on workforce efficiency and stress management in security personnel or similar sectors.   | Ok revised  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?  | The language is clear and appropriate for scholarly communication. Minor editorial improvements may enhance readability, particularly in complex or densely worded sections.  | Ok  |
| Optional/General comments  | I think this article is minor revision and can be accepted  |   |

PART 2:

|  | Reviewer's comment   | Author's comment <i>(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)</i> |
|--|--|--|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |  |