



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_15001
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF TRAINING ON EMPLOYEES' PRODUCTIVITY ORGANIZATION
Type of the 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The author must be sure of the state of readiness of her/his script before submission. She/he must have thoroughly examined the Journal's "house-style". Author when referencing must stick to Author:Date:Page. To omit the page only in exceptional circumstances. One gets worried when authors names that appear in the body of the Article referencing do not also appear in the Bibliography, where authors names must appear in their alphabetical order. Author to consult books on social science research methodologies and related referencing techniques. This work is poorly structured and badly edited. The presentation generally is simplistic and lacks depth. Author need revisit in-depth literature review and look for comparative publications in this field. Strange enough journal pages are referred to in the Bibliography. I reserve my further comments in this regard as that is the prerogative of the Editors. In as much as we would like to have scripts ultimately published, there	1., I would have love to join issues with the reviewer on academic points but since this is an academic process the advices of the reviewer are noted. 2., I humbly wish to draw the attention of the reviewer to the existence of several referencing styles/methods and books on social or management science research methodologies that exist in the academic parlance. It is important to note that no one method is superior to the other, however the APA 6th edition was employed in this manuscript. 3., on the issue of editing the advice of the review is noted and effected in the revised version of the manuscript



SDI Review Form 1.6

	must at the same time be commitment on the part of our authors. Overall, in-depth literature review is what is called for herein and author is accordingly asked to oblige. Author can harvest a lot of journal articles from “GOOGLE SCHOLAR” in this same field! And, take it up from there.	
Minor REVISION comments	Ethical issues:- Impress on author on the importance of accurate, appropriate and consistent academic writing and referencing.	All observations raised have been duly noted.
Optional/General comments	See above	