



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_8493
Title of the Manuscript:	Education or Experience; the Potentiality in Yielding the Best Productivity at the Working Environment
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 <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	Many sources cited in the article are not in the list of references. These have been highlighted in the body of the article. The author should endeavour to reference them. The authors should strictly follow the reference style of the journal when revisiting the reference section of the article	We have agreed with the reviewer about the citations in the articles are not in the reference. Therefore, changes have been made accordingly.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Author should use the SDI paper template to prepare the revised manuscript. All the styles of the journal should be carefully followed during revised manuscript preparation.	The revised manuscript has changed to the format of the SDI paper template. The styles of the journal are carefully followed and amended.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. All the minor treatments required to improve the quality of this article at the interim have been comprehensively and passionately identified, described and explained by the reviewer. This I hope the author will appreciate. The author should endeavour to treat them as directed in the reviewer's comment. The author should check through the entire work and ensure that he studies and understand these corrections and meticulously effect them. 2. The article was reviewed with the use of Adobe Reader. To enhance downloading and opening of the reviewer's comments, the author should be directed to use appropriate software.	We are very much highly appreciating the work that you had done. Helping us to peer review the entire work is a lot of work. We have taken consideration through all the corrections and amendments have been made. This will help improve the quality of the article as well as future manuscript work. Thanks for your contribution in taking the time to help peer review our work.