SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	**2012 BJEMT 2829**
Title of the Manuscript:	***Case study on Performance Management. A comprehensive approach***

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:
(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	Describe the areas of the framework before the research Methodology (p. 4). Instead of just referring the reader to Appendix 1, explain each component and the relationships between components briefly in the text. Compare and contrast this framework to other performance management systems that are tied to organizational mission and goals, for example, the Balanced Scorecard approach. In what ways are the components theoretically drive? Explain why this qualitative case method is valuable as an assessment for any firm's performance management program. A major finding from the evaluation is that the incentives were not strong enough. This isn't especially novel. It is problematic in the context of this firm, and generalizable perhaps to this type of firm, but hardly a new idea in the compensation/incentive literature. This firm underestimated the effects of the incentive system. Why? How would you contrast this with different philosophies of compensation—for instance, Apple stores having expert sales staff who are not on commission? How did the performance management system derive from the intended corporate culture (ex ante)? How did it affect the corporate culture over time (ex post facto)?	We have included the list of areas of the framework in the main text before methodology along with a brief explanation and connexions among them (page 4 & 5). Following Malmi & Brown (2008, pag.: 288) Balanced scorecard can only be considered as an element belonging to a broader control package. According to this, the article only explains the choice of Ferreira's among the alternative conceptual frames available for studying control elements as a package. Nevertheless we have included a paragraph to categorize BSC as one of the elements of a control package (pag.: 4). Besides, the case company didn't have a BSC. We agree we have added an explanation on the choice of case method (pag.: 6). We understand that the way the weak incentives system is mentioned in the conclusions section may lead to understand we considered a major finding but we didn't, we have rephrased this paragraph (pag.:12). We have added a sentence explaining why the incentive system didn't work (pag.:10). Corporate culture is not explicitly discussed in this paper, although it may be seen as implicit in the discussion of mission and vision. It is seen more as a contingent variable that may influence PMS design rather than an organizational characteristic that can be manipulated.

Minor REVISION comments	Explain how the feedback coaching process worked and how this related to the importance of information flows. Were managers trained to be coaches and developers of their people? Were they measured in this regard? What are the more "subtle ways of motivating and coordinating organisational behaviour…" (p. 11)?	The so-called coaching process is not such. It is the name given by the company to a subjective appraisal of subordinates. Consequently there is no training, or measurement of managers in this regards. We have modified the text to make clear this is only the name given to the report. (pag.:9) We have added examples of subtle ways of motivating in the text (pag.:12)
Optional/General comments	This paper is an excellent example of understanding and analysing performance management systems and processes as methods of control and, as importantly or more so, support for employee and organizational growth and development. The paper begins with a clear overview of the literature, presents an analytic framework, and proceeds to apply the framework to analyse the case based on detailed interviews. The paper explains how a purpose-driven system can be valuable, but miss the mark with insufficiently strong systems. The analysis shows the value to the company that was studied, suggesting the need to strengthen the reward system. It also shows the value of this type of assessment for diagnosing how well performance management elements are working as an integrated system and a process that unfolds over time.	Thank you