



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_7065
Title of the Manuscript:	The Intellectual Capital in Nonprofit Organizations (NPOs)
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	The article is devoted to the important and topical issue, namely, the study of laws describing the intellectual capital. The studies were conducted in a non-profit organization, which is especially important. The author collected and processed very interesting stuff. Hypotheses which have been put forward, statistically validated and justified. Statistical testing is a strength of the study. The presentation of the data is also selected some very original. Complied with the division of the text into sections according to the recommendations. However, with some provisions of the author's difficult to accept. In particular, he examines the characteristics	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of extensive enough retrieve the data, but nowhere this result does not apply. Although he could compare it with further data and obtain information on the impact of these factors on the final result. It is unclear exactly what was asked in the questionnaires and who these respondents. All data are abstract, have speculative character. It is unclear, what is the cause of the complexes, formed by the author, and why he took these indexes. The author in vain used the images M.R.Martinez-Torres. Were enough links, but the information have been presented in Figures 1 and 2 are redundant and can probably be eliminated. The necessary information is available in Figure 3. Figure 2 is essentially duplicates Figure 3, but in this case, less informative.	Processed data on PLS software, are shown in table 3. In the beginning, more data were collected and to this end, LISREL software was used. But unfortunately the results did not converge. The questionnaire is located the end of this article before resources. Because author use standard questionnaire and indexes are taken from it. Figure 1 is essential for Better understanding of figure 3 and its indexes. specially in measurement part of PLS model. Figure 2 was eliminated.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The results can be considered trivial in part, such as a thesis on the impact of human capital on structural capital and capital relations. Of course, for formal verification should compare all the three possibilities that by the author was done, but, after all, trivial results he should discuss separately. The text is also needs editing and proof-reading. Language for the author is not a native, so he makes mistakes. For example, instead the Sex he writes the Sexuality. In general, it is advisable to publish the article, but only after significant processing. The article will need to be reworked again subjected to peer review, and only then publish.	The hypothesis is examined separately. After that in part of discussion, full explanations are given. But in the other review comment, They asked me to write sexuality instead of gender! Thank you very much
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		