

The second review of the article «Investigate of Intellectual Capital in Nonprofit Organizations (NPOs)»

The article is written on the important subject and contains some interesting results, and it would be good to publish, but the incompleteness of the statement can not do it in the current form.

One of the basic requirements for any publication is that the text contains detailed information about what it is dedicated, and to understand it was not required to ask questions or seek additional sources of information. This article thus can not be described.

In fact, some provision of authors are puzzling. For example, in the title and text of the article refers to the application of the results in relation to non-profit organizations, but the study of the organization is engaged in construction of school buildings, develops certain funds, and by implication, a non-profit can not be in any way. The sample is also quite strange, 100 men and 25 women, it is difficult to understand what the general population it represents. The questionnaire of 40 questions selected from a standard questionnaire, but the principle, on which based selection the authors have not explained. They done it in the appendix, but in abbreviated form, 30 questions, instead of what has to say in the text, about what the authors asked the respondents.

Explanation of the authors have had not be considered satisfactory. The review has item «However, with some provisions of the author's difficult to accept. In particular, he examines the characteristics of extensive enough retrieve the data, but nowhere this result does not apply. Although he could compare it with further data and obtain information on the impact of these factors on the final result». The authors replied «Processed data on PLS software, are shown in table 3. In the beginning, more data were collected and to this end, LISREL software was used. But unfortunately the results did not converge». Thus these data does not make any sense. The review says «why he took these indexes», the authors replied «Because author use standard questionnaire and indexes are taken from it», that is not the answer essentially the question asked.

The question of the complexes by authors safely omitted, while the problem of the choice of these parameters may be the most important in the whole publication.

The authors excluded Figure 2, but left Figure 1 that duplicates Figure 3, but not informative. Its presence does not explain anything, and it must be removed.

The review states that the authors «instead the Sex writes the Sexuality». In its response, they write that «But in the other review comment, They asked me to write sexuality instead of gender!». It is not clear what kind of review in question, but even if so, they are the authors.

In general, patches are clearly insufficient, and as such I can not recommend an article for publication. If the corrections are made, the article should be considered again.