



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_13117
Title of the Manuscript:	Which is the Better Approach to Accommodate Non-pecuniary Factors in Work Incentive Models: Social Preference or Social Esteem?
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Introduction: Is not perfect	Line 25: We updated the literature.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Methodology: Need to be clearly formulated and developed.	We revised the organization of II Data and Model section and added some information.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Results: Results should be better organized. Discussion: Should interpret the findings in view of the results obtained in this and in past studies on this topic. If any ethical issue, please clarify	We related out findings to results in the past literature and expanded our discussion. Ethical issue considerations are described on page 5.