



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_10300
Title of the Manuscript:	Differences in perceptions among managers, academics, and students of the importance of various aspects of marketing knowledge and skills
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1) The document is NOT technically appropriate. It must be edited for grammar. 2) The literature review adequately covers the aspects of the study being measures; a drawback in this regard is that numerous references are old. Also, avoid the use of etc. – rather use for example, ... 3) The methodology does not describe the questionnaire in terms of variables tapped into, scale used, validity and reliability. Neither the population size nor the response rate is given. The hypotheses are not related to the title of assessing differences in the perceptions among managers, academics and students of the importance of various aspects of marketing knowledge and skills. They need to be reworded to relate to the topic. 4) In order to detect significant differences, it makes more sense to provide the p values and the interpretation of results should centre around where exactly the differences lie based on the Scheffe's and Turkey's tests. Also, sometimes hypotheses can only be partially accepted but this is not mentioned. In some instances, the researcher is assessing the top three knowledge areas but more than three are discussed. Also, results are not reported in descending mean order. 5) There should be a discussion of key results to	I have done. I have used some later references. It is not so much a newer references from this areas of study. I put for example. The hypotheses are related to the title of assessing differences in the perceptions among managers, academics and students of the importance of various aspects of marketing knowledge and skills. All important results are presented in tables and in the text.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	compare and contrast the findings with that of other researchers in the field. 6) The conclusion should be specific to the result obtained, for example, there are significant differences in the perceptions of marketing managers, students and academics about the skills and knowledge that marketing graduates must have if they are to be employed as marketing assistants – conclude exactly where the differences lie.	I have discussed in text (lines 337-340). I have described all important conclusions and implications.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) Editing.	I have done.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Use recent reference, take cognisance of report and discussion of results in accordance with the aims of the study.	I have used some later references. It is not so much a newer references from this areas of study.