SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_BJEMT_7941**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Recruitment and Selection in the Nigerian Public Service: Nature, Challenges and Way Forward**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	The paper is generally written very well, but the sample data which were taken not enough for comparison. Right from abstract any intended reader may be easily attentive. The author tried to present the background information to initiating the research, but need more precise information in this regard. In such type of paper, if qualitative in nature, some data for reliability and validity must be taken, so in qualitative paper some data must be based on quantitative in nature to prove the validity of the result.	
Minor REVISION comments	If the general using APA Style so the references are not on APA Style these should be changed.	
Optional/General comments	The author has tried to identify the subjects or source of the questionnaires utilized in the work. This situation casts a good shadow on the authenticity of the data used for analysis in this work.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Muhammad Hasim**
Department, University & Country	**Government college of management sciences Peshawar, Gandhara University, Peshawar, Pakistan**