



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
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 (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	Line 3: delete (;) and replace with (:). Line 7: delete (how). Line 12: add (resulting to), delete (result of). Line 14: Use upper case for the first letters of the key words. Line 21: write (Teacher) not teacher or Lecturer) not lecturer. Line 23: delete (well). Line 27: delete (d) from experienced and (m) from whom. Line 28: add (s) to mistake. Line 33: write (Energy Analyst) not (energy analyst). Line 44: write (boost the economic factors of), delete (boast economical factor for). Line 45: write (benefits) not (beneficial). Line 47: add (economic development), delete (economy). Line 48: add (ed) to (focus). Line 57: delete (year) add (period). Line 58: add (the) before (real). Line 66: delete (to) from (onto). Line 71: write as (economic development). Line 80: delete (downside towards). Line 81: delete (as it), (be) delete (s) from (differs). Line 82: replace (&) with (and). Do same across the paper. Line 83: delete (previously). Line 89: replace (recruiters) with (employers).	We have agreed on the reviewer's correction and changes have been made accordingly. Minor grammatical errors will hinder the publication process of our paper. Therefore it is with great respect that amendments have been made while revising each and every comment.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 98: delete (to) from (onto) and (s) from (groups). Line 104: delete (the) before (one of) and add it before (problem). Line 111: delete (According to) and (he). Line 112: add (that) after (observes), replace (everyday) with (daily), add (is) after (life). Line 113: add (s) to (conclude). Line 115: write (Journalist) not (journalist). Line 117: replace (do better) with (make). Line 118: delete (making). Line 123: write (Professor) not (professor). Line 125: delete (the) before (lack) and (of) before (confidence). Line 136: add (d) to (require). Line 140: delete(d) from (lived). Line 142: add (to) after (how). Line 143: add(ly) to (efficient). Line 148: add (who are familiar) after (people) and delete (that tend to be familiarized). Line 159: add (and Experience) and delete (and Education). Line 160: delete (according to); add ('s) after (2002); add (aimed) before (to). Line 161: delete (of). Line 162: delete(which how); add (s) to (reflect). Line 190: delete (Some of which); write (The) before (teachings). Line 191: add (comma sign) after (society); and (as the) before teaching. Line 192: add (This does not) after education and delete (it). Line 193: add (ily) to (necessary), replace (to) with (in) after meaningless; add (full stop sign) after society.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 195: delete (to) from (onto). Line 197: delete (a) before certain. Line 198: write (Professor), not (professor). Line 199: write (Professor), not (professor); replace (his) with (the). Lines 219 - 284: Use upper case letters for the first alphabets of all the key words; distinguish a Journal article with (inverted comma sign).	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The above has taken care of the minor corrections.	Minor corrections have taken into consideration and revised
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is relevant and topical. If the above corrections are effected, it would go a long way in improving the quality of the paper.	We are very much appreciated on your feedback and advice. We would like to thank your help on improving quality of the paper; gaining experiences as well. Thank you for taking into consideration in peer reviewing this manuscript.