



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_6631
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing Lower and Higher Order Needs: A Cross-Cultural Comparative
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	It would be necessary to revise the title, it is better to write <i>comparative study</i> or <i>comparison</i>. There is no sufficient number of relevant studies in the domain of interest. The methodology in the manuscript is not clear or meaningful to readers. There is no information which countries were included in the survey and way these countries participate. Author did not explain procedures clearly and in adequate detail. Analyses are not presented clearly.	The title has been revised to read “comparative study”. A search of the term “work motivation” in Business Source Complete yields over 12K results. I selected the works that were (in my judgement) most highly cited and relevant to the topic I covered. I added a paragraph at line 146 that explains my selection of the World Values Database, the countries selected, etc. I added Appendix A that more clearly elaborates the procedures in calculating the results. This comment is vague – if there were some specific point that was unclear, it could be corrected or edited.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Correct citation (Last name of the author/s, year of publication; p. page number)	Citations were corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It would be useful to improve describing of the sample and settings appropriate to research question.	