

Reviewer Comments to Author:

Reviewer:

2

See below comments

Overall, the paper was well-written and very informative. However, several limitations should be further addressed

1. **Originality:** Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?
The author needs to improve the continuity of ideas between paragraphs. Kindly revise the introduction part by explaining it from general to specific and then go back to the general one.
2. **Relationship to Literature:** Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?
The research gap according to the work carried out in the literature review must be clearly stated demonstrate the importance of the topic.
3. **Methodology:** Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?
The author ended up with a final sample of 550 people, with a response rate of 79%. Please clarify it more.
4. **Results:** Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?
The research results should be based on the observation results found in the field instead of the quotations taken from various references. The research results should show the impacts based on the research findings.
5. **Implications for research, practice and/or society:** Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?
Conclusions are used to respond to the research questions presented in the introduction. Has the objective of this research been indicated in the introduction?
6. **Quality of Communication:** Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.
Some minor corrections can be made to several typo mistakes that were found in the paper. Need to check again.

Authors response to reviewers comments:

Prof. Carla Curado

Associate Editor, Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance.

Dear sir,

Thanks for sending the review of our manuscript JOEPP-07-2022-0178.R1 entitled "Empirical analysis of workplace incivility, emotional exhaustion, and job outcomes". We have revised the paper and responded to the comments and highlighted them in color.

Thanking you

Authors

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Comment: The author needs to improve the continuity of ideas between paragraphs. Kindly revise the introduction part by explaining it from general to specific and then go back to the general one.

Response: The introduction part has been modified as recommended by the reviewer. The new and significant information adequate to justify publication has also been added to the introduction part. The author has clearly explained what previous work has been done (Cortina et al, 2001; Leiter, Laschinger, Day, & Oore, 2011; Lim, Cortina & Magley, 2008), what has not been done (These job outcomes have not been studied collectively in higher education sector especially in India. Particularly, the variables have not been studied collectively as proposed in the study model), and what does the present study do (This study contributes to the body of knowledge on COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989) by emphasizing workplace incivility as a social stressor at work)

Comments: The research gap according to the work carried out in the literature review must be clearly stated to demonstrate the importance of the topic.

Response. The Literature Review and Hypothesis Development chapter has been rewritten as per the research gap and also an appropriate range of literature sources has been added as recommended.

Comment: The author ended up with a final sample of 550 people, with a response rate of 79%. Please clarify it more.

Response. The total number of questionnaires distributed was 700. Only 550 correct responses were received with a response rate of 79% (out of 700).

Comment: The research results should be based on the observation results found in the field instead of the quotations taken from various references. The research results should show the impacts based on the research findings.

Response. As recommended by the reviewer, the research results were cross-checked and our results are entirely based on the observation results found in the paper. We have mentioned the previous studies because they also substantiate our results. Our motive is to justify our results with literature support.

Comment: Conclusions are used to respond to the research questions presented in the introduction. Has the objective of this research been indicated in the introduction?

Response. The objectives of this research are indicated in the introduction part and the conclusion is modified and rewritten according to objectives and results (The current study examines the connections between emotional exhaustion, workplace incivility, and job outcomes (job satisfaction, job stress, and intention to leave the company). The results of this study suggest that emotional exhaustion serves as a mediator between workplace incivility and the three job outcomes)

Comment: Some minor corrections can be made to several typo mistakes that were found in the paper.

Response. We have tried our best to remove typo mistakes.

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Major Revision

Comment; I suggest the authors must improve the writing structure: (a) what previous work has been done? (b) what has not been done? (c) what does the present study do?

Response: The introduction part has been modified as recommended by the reviewer. The new and significant information adequate to justify publication has also been added to the introduction part. We have tried to explain what previous work has been done (Cortina et al, 2001; Leiter, Laschinger, Day, & Oore, 2011; Lim, Cortina & Magley, 2008), what has not been done (These job outcomes have not been studied collectively in the higher education sector, especially in India. Particularly, the variables have not been studied collectively as proposed in the study model), and what does the present study do (This study contributes to the body of knowledge on COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989) by emphasizing workplace incivility as a social stressor at work)

Comment: Overall, the Literature Review and Hypothesis Development chapter should be rewritten.

Response.: The concerns raised by the Reviewer in this part have been looked after and it was assured that such contradictory statements should not appear again by rewriting revise of the literature Review.

COR theory has been elaborated in more detail in the Review of Literature The Literature Review and Hypothesis Development chapter has been rewritten as per the recommendation of the reviewer.

Comment: Are results presented clearly and analyzed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper? Theoretical implications

The theoretical contribution has not been properly stated as the authors were claiming already established contribution that has been taken care of. The Study adds more theoretical support to COR and SDT models which authors tried to justify. Furthermore, the study does contribute to the literature by introducing emotional exhaustion as mediating variable between Workplace incivility and Job outcomes.

Comment: The author needs to test the Common Method Bias Or CMV Response: Even though we collected data in two waves, common method bias or variation occurs (Doty and Glick, 1998; Podsakoff, 2012) as the data came from a single source. As such this limitation might be present in our research

Comment: The continuity of ideas in all paragraphs is very poor; the author must be noticed throughout the article.

Response. The continuity of ideas in all paragraphs has been looked after and serious efforts have been made to make the article meet the publication standard.

.
Thanking You in Anticipation

Dr. Zahoor Ahmad Parray
Assistant Professor
Department of Management Studies
South Campus
University of Kashmir.