

Review Form2

Book Name:	An Overview of Literature, Language and Education Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2558
Title of the Manuscript:	CAREER FLEXIBILITY- A POST COVID -19 PANDEMIC APPROACH
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The author(s) bring out relevant issue, however the following things need to be improved; 1. Most of the literature cited is outdated and may no longer be relevant to addressing the issue effectively. 2. The survey contains only three questions, which is hardly sufficient to qualify as comprehensive research. 3. The questions were not properly developed in alignment with the proposed theoretical framework. 4. The discussion fails to engage in meaningful analysis and is insufficiently developed.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. There is no discussion on how the skills are relevant to the flexibility in carreer. Suggestion: The impact of Covid-19 on skills and employment	
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 does not relecting the whole paper. The objective outline in the abstract is “A survey was carried out on University graduates to analyze the employment status of youth to the skills they acquired at the University.” Yet, there is no question asking about the skills acquired from the university	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. The research objectives should be explained in the introduction section, not in the literature review.	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper is barely scientific!	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Not sufficient and recent.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language needs an upgrade.	
Optional/General comments	The paper needs major revision. -Relate theory with the findings. Add suggestions.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nabila Huda Ibrahim
Department, University & Country	Institute for Advanced Studies, Universiti Malaya, Malaysia