



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
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>)

PART 1: Review Comments**SCIENCEDOMAIN international**www.sciencedomain.org

<u>SDI Review Form 1.6</u>	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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The number of literatures considered in this article for its conclusion may be increased to improve its accuracy of findings. Industry wise segregation of literature may be presented and reviewed to make the article more sensitive to address the differences in requirements for implementing TQM across the different industry sectors.	Few more recent studies are included in the paper. For an industry wise review a very detail study is needed which is impossible to be done for this paper an industry wise segregation is possible only by doing a detail meta analysis.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author has reviewed published articles in TQM to interpret its influence on organisational performance as innovative. But the author is not confined his content of literature review. The spectrum of literature collection shows inconstancy in the time period i.e. the author has used literature published from 2001 to 2012, but it lacks in the quantity of articles. Only 44 articles were considered for review which may not represent the true scenario of TQM in industry performance.	The study has tried to justify the objectives set in the study the overall suggestion made by the reviewer is beyond the scope of this paper.