|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Journal Name: | Journal of Global Economics, Management and Business Research |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_JGEMBR\_13609** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Determinants of Work Productivity in Health Institutions: Empirical Evidence from Tanoh Gayo Hospital, Gayo Lues** |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 1: Comments** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment**  **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript provides valuable empirical evidence on the key determinants of labor productivity in a healthcare setting, focusing specifically on the interplay between the work environment, human capital, and employee engagement. Its significance lies in identifying employee engagement as the most influential factor on productivity, thereby offering profound insights for researchers and practitioners in health management. By demonstrating that these three variables collectively account for 82.2% of the variance in productivity, the study underscores the need for an integrated human resource strategy within hospitals, particularly in remote, resource-scarce areas such as Gayo Lues. Furthermore, the study contributes to the growing body of literature on organizational behavior in the public health sector, presenting a replicable model for similar institutions aiming to  enhance service delivery through improved employee performance. | Thank you for your encouraging and insightful feedback. We are pleased that the manuscript is recognized as providing valuable empirical evidence on the determinants of labor productivity in healthcare, particularly highlighting the dominant role of employee engagement. To strengthen this point, we have refined the discussion to emphasize the implications of an integrated human resource strategy for hospitals in resource-scarce areas like Gayo Lues, as well as the contribution of this study to broader organizational behavior literature in the public health sector. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | My suggation is “The Impact of Work Environment, Human Capital, and Employee Engagement on Work Productivity in a Rural Hospital Setting: Evidence from Tanoh Gayo Hospital, Indonesia” | Thank you, reviewers, for your input and suggestions. However, we agree more with another reviewer's paper, titled "Determinants of Employee Productivity in Health Institutions: Evidence from Tanoh Gayo Hospital, Gayo Lues, Indonesia." |
| **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.** | Yes, the abstract is generally comprehensive and follows a standard structure by including the objectives, study design, location, duration, methodology, results, and conclusion. | Thank you for your positive feedback. We are pleased that the abstract is considered comprehensive and well-structured, covering objectives, study design, location, duration, methodology, results, and conclusion. Therefore, no major revisions were required in this section. |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound and generally correct in terms of its research design, methodology, data analysis, and conclusions. | Thank you for your positive comment. We are glad that the manuscript is considered scientifically sound and correct in terms of research design, methodology, data analysis, and conclusions. Therefore, no major revisions were necessary in this section. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have**  **suggestions of additional** | It needs to add modern references up to the year 2025 that are also directly related to the topic and related to analysis and study. I  suggest these references**:** | Thank you for your helpful suggestion. We have added the recommended modern and foundational references to strengthen the theoretical framework and ensure alignment with recent scholarly discussions. Specifically, we incorporated:   1. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). *Job demands‐resources theory.* In C. L. Cooper, M. P. Leiter, & W. B. Schaufeli (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 37–56). Taylor & Francis. 2. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056> 3. Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education.* University of Chicago Press. 4. Knight, C., Patterson, M., & Dawson, J. (2017). The relative impact of work design and office type on employee experiences of the indoor environment. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 51,* 172–182. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2017.04.002> 5. Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1*(1), 3–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x   These references have been integrated into the literature review and discussion sections where relevant, thereby strengthening both the theoretical and empirical base of the manuscript. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **references, please mention them in the review form.** | 1. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). *Job demands‐resources theory*. In: Cooper, C.L., Leiter, M.P., & Schaufeli, W.B. (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 37–56). Taylor & Francis. 2. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands- resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056> 3. Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*. University of Chicago Press. 4. Knight, C., Patterson, M., & Dawson, J. (2017). The relative impact of work design and office type on employee experiences of the indoor environment. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 51*, 172–182. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2017.04.002> 5. Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1*(1), 3–30. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x)   [9434.2007.0002.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x) |  |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | While the manuscript effectively conveys its research and the meaning is generally clear, the current level of English does not fully meet the standard expected for international scientific journals without revision. | Thank you for your important remark. We acknowledge that the English language required improvement to meet international publication standards. Therefore, we have thoroughly revised the manuscript for grammar, clarity, flow, and academic tone to ensure it aligns with the expectations of international scientific journals. |
| **Optional/General** comments |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s Feedback** (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)* | We declare that there are no conflicts of interest and ethical issues in this study that could affect the results or interpretation of the findings. |