



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	➤ Authors provided relevant and current references during discussion. ➤ No Discussion presented and the conclusion based on actual facts, but it needs to enlargement. ➤ I strongly recommend to use realistic data from the Nigerian Public Service, and analyzing it statistically, to confirm the concluded results that presented in the abstract, if possible. ➤ The Author adopts qualitative research strategy using comprehensive document review and the manuscript is technically sound.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	➤ No sufficient or appropriate statistical analyses carried out. ➤ The conclusion part could be more detailed.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The research is informative and based on sound concepts. There is a good consistency in the paper. It follows the basic principles of a good research. I would like to recommend this paper to publish.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wael Hassan El-Garaihy
Department, University & Country	Business administration department, University of Dammam, Saudi Arabia