



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_7570
Title of the Manuscript:	Stakeholders’ Perception on Self Help Group’s Quality Parameters: A Psychometrics Analysis

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors’ response to final evaluator’s comments
The manuscript is much improved, and due to the statistical significance of the hypothesis regarding QAP-II, I can recommend publication. Technical issues are almost completely corrected and proper evaluation of the conducted research is now possible. There are, however, some minor revisions to be made. Abstract: Study Design states “based on empiricism” – do you mean “empirical method”? “specially structured questionnaires were prepared which <u>was</u> later” should be “were”, preferably “and were” instead of “which” –currently the sentence is awkward “Chroabanch alpha” should be Cronbach’s alpha” “Eta Test” – you probably mean that “magnitude of the effect was provided by means of eta-squared” “It was observed from KW Test that there exists enough evidence to conclude that there is a no difference” – as I mentioned earlier, a Kruskal-Wallis test is not enough to conclude a lack of difference, unless it is either coupled with enough statistical power (eta) or tested by means of Bayesian probability of a no-difference hypothesis. Line 136: “The country like India” – awkward statement; perhaps “in India” would suffice, or use a more generalized statement of what you mean by “like India” Lines 231-246, Figure 1: The QAP parameters are still described as numbers – what information does it provide? Wouldn’t it be better to use the statements in this paragraph? The tables describing these parameters are at the very end of the manuscript. Line 282: What is the point of stating the null hypothesis? H1 provides all the needed information, and H0 is only of methodological importance, and only if NHST methods are applied Line 290: “The research design...” – the statement is unnecessary, and awkward from a language point of view Lines 326 and 329 provide contradictory data on the number of collected questionnaires: 116 vs 100. Also, “86% response rate” without the “of”. 335: questionnaires were collected (please stick to the past tense)	



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

374-383: is the geographic information about Nagaon important for the study? If yes, how? If no, please consider shortening or deleting it. Age composition: I still suggest means and SD's for the total sample, as it enables the readers to properly evaluate the sample (regardless of whether age has any effect on the obtained results, it is just good practice). 430: "Caste is the social variable in India" – the statement does not really help understand the composition in Table 7 683: "we drafted..." should be "a pool of (...) was drafted – I would recommend sticking to impersonal sentences throughout the manuscript 693: "relevance" instead of 'relevancy" Table 26: just checking, are these numbers really that high? Is it eta-squared or just eta correlation? 788: "nascent stage", "common yardstick" – please consider using more direct language 814: "groups of QAP-I are more decisive..." – don't the results state the exact opposite, that QAP-II provides the significant differences? 817-826: Are descriptions of basic statistical theory necessary? Some minor language errors are present in some parts of the manuscript, please consider reading it thoroughly and correcting these errors.	
--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mateusz Polak
Department, University & Country	Institute of Psychology, Jagiellonian University, Poland