



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_7570
Title of the Manuscript:	Stakeholders' Perception on Self Help Group's Quality Parameters: A Psychometrics Analysis
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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	The article is an original research . The title is well defined, draws attention to the issue to be developed and gives us an idea of what will be developed . The summary is drawn adequately covering all parts of the study. The key words are appropriate . The introduction is clear and contextualizes the issue properly . The literature review discusses the concepts necessary to develop the study and contains recent articles.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The article poses the problem appropriately. The objectives and hypothesis are clear and concise. The methodology does not make clear what were the criteria for mounting the show was not as the collection of primary and secondary data. Nor is it clear how they will analyze the perception . I Suggest that describe more adequately. The authors describe the results of a very interesting and intense sample profile but it does not analyze the perception is that the real objective of the study . Issues relating to perception are placed on the analysis and discussion . I suggest reviewing	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	. Conclusions should be revised to suit the result and analyze and discuss the objectives and hypothesis.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer