



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_13307
Title of the Manuscript:	A Focus Group Study Management and Decision Behavior: Examining Gender Differences With Management and Decision Behavior in Donald Trump's <i>The Apprentice</i>
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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	See below.	
Minor REVISION comments	See below.	
Optional/General comments	1. The topic is interesting. The data gathering work is time consuming and the paper is unique in terms of this. 2. The sample pool is very meaningful especially for the college students, undergraduate and graduate. 3. The conclusions are meaningful not only from the theoretical perspective but from the practical perspective. 4. The lit review is thorough and well-organized.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	5. The author needs to be mindful that as this is a paper that was presented in conference, the publish of this paper should be original or not a “twin version” of anything that has been published before. 6. The methodology used in this paper is not strong enough. I am not saying that the more complicated econometrics model being used, the better. In fact, the complexity of the model is irrelevant and it is the properness of the model that dictates the use of it/them. Simply comparing the differences here is not convincing. In fact, the author(s) have a very good pool of cross-sectional data, and the model fits the 0-1 type of dependent variable is PROBIT or LOGIT. Using those two (or one of them) can make the results more reliable and descriptive, as the probabilities are more straight forward than saying “more males thought the project manager (PM) should be fired compared to females.” 7. The author(s) needs to be mindful that the gender-related topics should stick to the description of facts, instead of subjectively assert that which gender should do what. For example, “more males thought the project manager (PM) should be fired compared to females. In the focus groups, more females were more neutral compared to males.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Furthermore, more females thought both the PM and a group member should be fired compared to males.” 8. A survival model fits the context as the show is an ongoing one, and following each candidate to see the survival rate at each round is interesting. 9. DT has two assistants in the show all the time, and the author(s) can involve their decisions too.	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	Not detected at the current moment. <i><u>The author(s) needs to be mindful that the gender-related topics should stick to the description of facts, instead of subjectively assert that which gender should do what.</u></i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Huijian Dong
Department, University & Country	College of Business, Pacific University, Oregon, USA