



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_8856
Title of the Manuscript:	Participation and Empowerment through Self Help Groups: Does Volunteerism Mediate the Relationship?
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Introduction third paragraph: Initially presents the idea that psychological and social resources mediate effects of volunteerism. Then shifts to volunteerism as a mediator. The latter does not necessarily follow from the former. Methodology: Needs citations for the scales Results: Needs to provide the end points of the scales (1 – 5?). In the text the means are reported but not the standard deviations. They should be reported. Mediation Analysis—the values in the figures are reported as betas but in the text they are often referred to as “r.” Also some betas are marked as statistically significant (*) but in the text they are reported as not being statistically significant. So there is inconsistency between the figures and the text. Also, the last sentence in each Model section is incomplete. Discussion: Given the above comments, the conclusions may not be correct. Why is Table 9 in this section? It should be included in the Results.	The authors agreed with the reviewer. Therefore, corrections have been done and highlighted. Corrections have been done The scales have been provided All these corrections have been done Last sentence in each model section is completed The table 9 has been moved from discussion section to result now.
Minor REVISION comments	There are several omissions and grammatical errors. For example, in the Introduction paragraph 1, line 2, a word is missing after “ancient.” I think it is “tradition.” If so the first and second sentences are redundant. The same error occurs in the Literature Review. Also in that section Results should be plural not singular. SHG also needs to be defined somewhere in the text. In the Discussion section the last sentence in the first paragraph is incomplete.	
Optional/General comments	I would suggest the authors proof the article for consistency and completeness.	