



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_10056
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effects of Diagnostic and Interactive Performance Measurement Systems on Organisational Commitment and Job Satisfaction: The Perception of Information and Communication Technology Practitioners in Hong Kong
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	- Abstract need to be revised. - it is mentioned in abstract that 299 questionnaires were received, but in methodology portion it is stated that 302 questionnaires were received - it is mentioned that some demographics have influence on job satisfaction and organizational commitment and others have not. But there is no evidence related to impact of demographics on dependent variables is present in the analysis portion - Research questions should be defined clearly. - Problem should be clearly defined	- The authors agreed with the comment and have made correction of it. The effects of demographics have been studied in the original research paper. However, the effects of demographics to job satisfaction and organizational commitment were not significant, so the findings of these effects were not included in this manuscript. - The two research questions are added into the descriptions of research model. - The problem had been described in the part 1.1 Background of the Research
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Discussion & conclusion should be separately narrated (or at least clearly is identified in the study). - Limitation and future research section should be proof read again as it contains duplication of sentence.	The authors agreed with the comment and conclusion was added. The authors agreed with the comment and have made correction of it.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall study is good enough and much informative in terms of analysis and literature.	