



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJEMT_16537
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception on Organisational attractiveness: An African Sample.
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 <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	1. Some citations are not listed in the references such as Bax (2004). Make sure references are updated. 2. There are some errors in terms of citations. For example, Konrad, AM, Ritchierd, J. E. Jr, Lieb, P. and Corigall, E. (2000) should be written as Konrad, Ritchierd, Lieb, and Corigall (2000) 3. Make sure the purpose @ objectives of the study are consistent. On page 3, the author(s) stated 4 purposes, but on page 8, there are only 3 objectives. 4. Explain how convenience sampling was executed. 5. Some of the literature is not related with the study. They can be retained. However, the literature should focus more on components of organizational attractiveness and demographics factors. These are the focus of the study. 6. The different between “perceived employing sector” and “job sector seeking preference” deserve some elaboration. 7. The implication of the perceived reward structure / job sector seeking preference on	1. Bax (2004) is not a lone author. The citation is Glebbeek and Bax, (2004). See line 360. 2. Review taken care of. See lines 32 and 216. 3. The omitted purpose has been inserted. See line 209. 4. Done in line 214 See 246-248 See 327-331



SDI Review Form 1.6

	organization need greater attention in the discussions section. - References should be rearranged according to alphabetical order. - Make sure the format to write the references are consistent. The name of the journal should be italic. Some are not.	8. In previous publication in this journal, the format for references was as written in this article. However, see attached. 9. This has been reviewed. All journal names are in italics. See lines 355-357, 359-361, 363-365, 367-368, 383-388, 423
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Section 2.3 on organizational attractiveness and individual characteristics should emphasized more on demographics characteristics. Not so much on personality as this is not the focus of the study. - To facilitate readers understanding, the abstract should state clearly the purpose of the study.	Section 2.3 have been reviewed to emphasise more on demographics characteristics. See line 150 to 178
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- Organizational attractiveness status of the youth (Table 2) can be compared between male and female. This can add value to the study. - Should have label the components of organizational attractiveness in Table 2 - The limitation section can be expanded by adding one or two more limitations. - I would suggest that the topic be changed. Such as "Perception on organizational attractiveness: An African Sample"	Topic adopted with thanks