



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_6311
Title of the Manuscript:	HR Competencies: Understanding the Impact on HR and Organizational Performance in Saudi Arabia
Type of the Article	Empirical study

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	1. The abstract should include the results of study. 2. The manuscript lacks of research framework. 3. There have no clear definitions for each dimension. 4. The methodology is too simple to explain the managerial implication of results. 5. The sample data collected from different periods that should inspect it the differences or not. 6. The sample size is too small. 7. The manuscript didn't discuss the structure of questionnaire and the operation definition of each construct. 8. The sample distributed from position is employee (32) and manager (14). But employees are not suitable to analyse the topic of issue. 9. How the sample comes from? 10. The manuscript should define the hypotheses and use suitable method to test the result. The table 12 is not listed in research topic.	Abstract has been revised. Given the nature of the research, the methodology was appropriate to start gathering data on HR practices/competencies. The sample was a stratified sample among HR professionals in different industries, size of organization, and gender.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. What is the difference between HRM and HRD? 2. Line 29 argue change to argued... 3. The manuscript didn't discuss the performance of HR competency. 4. The definition of competence which located in line 39 is not suitable. 5. Parts of sentences are repeat, such as line 93-97, line 120-128. 6. Part of tables and figures are the same meanings. It's redundancy.	Adjusted these



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		