



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_13307
Title of the Manuscript:	A Focus Group Study Management and Decision Behavior: Examining Gender Differences With Management and Decision Behavior in Donald Trump's <i>The Apprentice</i>
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	The paper addresses differences in gender concerning management decisions. It is an empirical study, which makes use of a focus group that was asked to predict, analyze and interpret the managerial decisions taken on the TV show <i>The Apprentice</i>. The study is original, interesting and delivers meaningful results. It is a contribution that helps in elucidating the determinants of decision-making in a managerial context, and how men and women decide when faced with identical scenarios. I believe that the paper should be published although it would benefit from a few changes before acceptance: a) The introduction is not sufficiently focused and does not motivate well the problem under study (e.g., the first sentence is completely unnecessary; it is too general); a last paragraph in the introduction should be inserted, with a brief guide about the contents of the remainder of the paper; b) There are several typos that should be corrected (e.g., in the abstract, the sentence 'This is study is a continuation a prior study conducted on <i>The Apprentice</i>.' (??)); c) Results should be discussed in more depth and compared with other results in the literature.	a) Authors agree with the comments; Authors will review and revise. b) Authors agree with the comments; Authors will review and revise. c) <u>Authors do not agree with this comment.</u> As stated in the article, there have not been any prior studies on <i>The Apprentice</i>. This study is the first to conduct an empirical and focus group on this show. Despite many MBA programs in universities using the show as a teaching tool, no one has attempted to conduct a focus group study on it or collected empirical data. So, you cannot compare results in the prior literature because those results do not exist.
Minor REVISION comments	The title of the paper is not the best choice. I like more the title of the conference presentation that is mentioned in the footnote: 'Gender and Management Decisions: A Focus Group Study on Gender Decision Behavior in Donald Trump's <i>The Apprentice</i>.'	Authors somewhat agree. However, we made the decision to change the title of the manuscript because we do not want confusion between the conference presentation and the manuscript. We wanted both titles to be separate and not the same. We made



SDI Review Form 1.6

		a conscious effort to prevent this. However, we will revise the title and make it better.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

