



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_7106
Title of the Manuscript:	TQM practices and innovation performance: A review of current literature
Type of the Article	Review 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	(1) Table 5 needs to analyzed and synthesized further, such as Which quality management practices are frequently used among different industries? Which quality management practices are frequently used among different industries? How effective are these quality practices in terms of results in enhancing firm's innovation performance? (2) 4.0.Latest trends in total quality management literature haven't enough insight, you must give direct evidences (3) Section 5.0 should be two parts, one positive and another negative	Table 5 is rewritten with clear explanation of type of quality technique and its effect on innovation performance. The negative and positive trends are discussed separately in revised manuscript as suggested in part 6.0
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	(1) I suggest that 4.0 and 5.0 merge, and give discuss on five objectives of study as 5.0 in general. (2) The conclusion is too short, it should be give important enlightenment according the objectives of study	Before conclusion a discussion part is added in the revised manuscript which is justifying the final conclusion made
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	(1) The objectives of study are very good (2) Methodology needs to be improved (3) The presentation also needs to be improved	The objectives are merged in introduction part and abstract is also improved