SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_BJEMT_5785**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Investigation of Employees' Stress Level: The Case of Cell Phone Industry**
Type of the Article	**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** *(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	When stress is discussed there should be some framework in which to 1. Determine the variables that define stress …2. Can those variables be measured ….3. what impact do those variables have on the employee? Saying that stress will be measured is far too broad a subject to measure…you might measure Levels of Stress as define by those variables that make up a given level of stress… The authors identify most of the variables as Sub Scales….These are really the independent variables that are manipulated to determine the dependent variable called Stress…e.g. you manipulate ambiguity of work of role to determine how that effects the level, of stress in a given subject. 2.1 actually identifies the dependent variables for this study…then the authors add many more that are not spelled out … "The main purpose of this study was to investigate the stress level of employees of cellular Companies…" If this is the case this would be a global study and the authors do not have a representative sample…If this is a study about cell companies in a given country then this study would make more sense… A questionnaire adapted from Ismail and Teck-Hong (2011) consisting of 37 items (i.e. 3 items 136 covered demographical information while 32 were stress variables and 1 item measured 137 employees' loyalty) THIS SURVEY MEASURES THE	Correct. Added in yellow colour. Yes they are but grouped in sub-scales which contribute towards the total stress measured by the scale. Explanation is given Yes. Topic statement, questions, discussion and conclusion corrected. Corrected as 36. The last item for loyalty was added to the original scale to see whether or not employees intend to continue their current job. It's

	COMPARISON OF STRESS VARIABLES AND EMPLOYEE LOYALTY…IT DOES DNOT MEASURE THE VARIABLES LISTED AND HOW THEY RELATE TO STRESS ITSELF. THE MEASURING DEVICE IS INCORRECT. If one tail "t" tests and anova were used then why is correlation the result? There should be the analysis of "P" and F values that should be analysed. The authors don't know anything about statistics… The finds and conclusions are based on the wrong statistical analysis…	measurement is given in results and is justified in discussion section. Corrected. Correlation is not the result. It is used just to prove the internal consistency of the scale through correlations within the sub-scales and correlations of sub-scales with the total scale. P values and F values are there for significance and comparison purposes.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Please see the list of issues below with this paper. It needs to be re-done before it can be reviewed for acceptance. **The issues I originally had with the paper have been addressed. The paper is much stronger now and is considered for publication.**	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer