



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_14826
Title of the Manuscript:	THE INFLUENCE OF EMPLOYEE HUMAN RESOURCE SATISFACTION ON EMPLOYEE INNOVATIVE WORK BEHAVIOR
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	A relevant study in today's innovation driven business climate. The proposed research model is valid and replicable. However, the novelty is low and generalization is difficult to apply due to a very small sample size. It would be nice to use these 5 companies as a case study (qualitative research) instead.	I agree with the reviewer's comments. Caution on how the study generalization should be made is incorporated in the discussion section. My future study will focus more on qualitative aspects of the study companies to compliment the quantitative approach employed in this study
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The literatures on the employee HR satisfaction and job demands perceptions still insufficient and it is advisable to add more literatures on this part of the writing (the arguments put forward seem not significant).	I agree with the comments, however, since HR satisfaction is a multidimensional construct, thus much of the literature used was related and relevant to the HR satisfaction, work demand and IWB framework proposed.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		