



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_7744
Title of the Manuscript:	Perceived Support and Work Attitudes among Korean Fitness Club Employees
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Section 2 Methodology: Put in sub headings before participants called Population and Sampling framework. This will give the reader an idea of what percentage of the population the sample is.	In a population like this, the frame is unknown as there is no data on how many people work in the industry and who they are. Therefore, it is not possible to calculate the percentage of sample from the population. In a sport management field, it is very common to work with unknown population frame.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Please check if referencing is in line with the Journal's style guide / requirement. - Line 194: space before the 3 - Line 216: times should read items - Line 221: space before A - Line 342: space after s - The document should be language edited	All corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is a great piece of research – well done. I liked figure 1. Are you able to put the SEM results on to figure 1 to show the strength of those relationships? It would be the cherry on the top if possible.	1. I don't think putting the SEM results on to figure 1 would make sense as it is the proposal of the model at that stage. The results shouldn't be reported in the introduction as they are reported in the results section.