



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_7941
Title of the Manuscript:	Recruitment and Selection in the Nigerian Public Service: Nature, Challenges and Way Forward
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

	without giving due considerations to the attitudes and character that the applicant possess' (page 6, lines 340-342). It's annoying because this paper part presents results but we don't know where the results come from. Part 9 of this paper should be more developed but I don't think document review is adequate for highlighting such results because documents will only give formal information that do not reflect the way recruitment and selection practices are really implemented and used: interviews seem more appropriate in order to compare the way Nigerian public service is supposed to recruit and select new workers and the way it really works.	the word result was replaced with findings which could best be used to reflect what the researcher discovered in the course of evaluating the documents.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The references do not include all the authors mentioned in the paper (for example, Mathis 1991 mentioned on page 2, line 80; Pilbeam and Corbridge, 2006 mentioned on pages 2 and 3) The author mentions on page 2 Mondy & Noe but he writes 'Monday & Noe' in references Page 7, line 386 : the author writes 'recruitment and selection are the instruments used by the Nigerian public service...' → It would be appropriate to speak about 'practices' rather than instruments The paper contains a few typographical and spelling mistakes (for example, page2, line 104, the author has to write 'Perhaps there are certain protocols...' rather than 'perhaps there are certain protocols...')	Effected as suggested.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		