



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_9201
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Change Management on Operational Excellence in Electrical and Electronics Industry: Evidence from Malaysia
Type of the Article	Scientific

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	In the Abstract sounds strange "Based on the literated syntheses". I think "Based on the literature review" would be better. Table 1 Table 1 is not a table. Tables are preferably used for numeric and statistical data. I suggest using Figure 1. In the section: results and discussion is essential to "rescue" the theory used.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I recommend improving the section: conclusion. What were the main contributions of the article? Who are the main targets in the search results? What are the knowledge gaps filled?	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article is well written and well structured.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer