



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. The paper currently looks like a cut and paste from a Masters or a PhD thesis as you do not write objectives as section, this should be embedded in the introduction section. 2. The introduction has not justified why this research is warranted. 3. The over use of tables in the paper is very glaring, for example you do not need a table for definition for quality. 4. Try also to refrain from using bulleted lists, not very academic. 5. The paper is full of tables that's about it. A paper is supposed to be not like that. 6. The paper needs to be re-written. References are also dated and need to be updated.	The objectives are emerged in introduction part as suggested. Few more arguments are added in introduction to justify the importance of study. The definitions are now explained in plain text not in a table. The paper now discusses an introduction part the methodology part and discussion parts the findings and trends in literature. Few more studies from 2012 and 2013 are added in the paper.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper needs more work and it is not ready in its current version	