



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJEMT_18122
Title of the Manuscript:	WHISTLE BLOWING: SAFEGUARD OR CAREER WRECKER?
Type of the Article	Policy 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	This is a timely subject. While the author is passionate about this subject, I would suggest revising the style to be unbiased. Refrain from word choices such as "endemic dysfunctional black mark" and "life-shattering economic and psychological trauma". More examples include "They fudge the books to make profits and to make their divisions look good;" "The notorious Enron and WorldComcases" or "She got wind that some of the company's divisions wereengaged in crooked accounting practices." Note the typographical errors as well for spacing, fragments, and other grammatical issues (these are persistent in the paper). General words such as "they" do not identify "who." Perhaps: Corporate executives often have goals contrary to shareholders or stakeholders. This style is too casual as currently written. Consider editing to remove bias and change word choice. The continued "blowing the whistle" needs to have alternative words. Suggestions would include: disclosing information to authorities, contacting appropriate reporting agencies, or other phrases. Spacing is incorrect as written, without proper space between paragraphs in some instances. Literature review is sparse at best. Agency conflict is at the root of this issue, and the author does not	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	address seminal works such as Jensen-Meckling, Kohlberg, others. These authors should appear where the current author places “Motivations for and Extent of Whistle-blowing” in my opinion, rather than citing actual cases of whistle-blowing. The author is redundant in 2.3 “Notable Whistle-blowers.” This is where the aforementioned ‘examples’ should appear, if at all. I suggest many of them be removed.	
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments	Clarify the plagiarised issue The entire article is plagiarised. http://www.wbiconpro.com/434-Amaram.pdf This article literally begins exactly the same, and unless the author I have reviewed is Dr. Donatus I Aram, the author who submitted this to you wasted your time and my time.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Waynesburg University, USA