

Reviewer's Response and Observations regarding manuscript entitled "WHISTLE BLOWING: SAFEGUARD OR CAREER WRECKER?"

The essence of critical review of manuscripts is to ensure maintaining high quality publication in agreement with global practices. I observed, the author is not comfortable with my observations and advice, particularly, with regards to in text citation. This is inferred from the statement of the author "his citation requirements seem to go beyond the bounds of what is necessary. He seems to ignore the fact that the following generally need no citations: Statements of fact that are common knowledge, Author's opinions and Author's predictions, speculations or wishful thinking. Repetitive citations within same sentence make for tedious writing and reading and may even be flagged by other reviewers". With this mind set, I discovered he went beyond or perhaps, not ready to take some advice. First, my observations regarding citation began with line 25 of the original manuscript, i.e, end of first paragraph, which was obviously outside the abstract section. But the author in his revised paper provided citations in the abstract section. Perhaps, he knows better. Also, in my observations I stated "Thus, it is not wrong citing the same author severally in a paragraph". However, the Author responded by stating that "Repetitive citations within same sentence make for tedious writing and reading and may even be flagged by other reviewers". What is the meaning of repetitive citations within the same sentence? If I may understand you, it is impossible to cite a particular author more than once in a sentence, but where ideas in one sentence are drawn from different authors; it becomes practically necessary to cite those authors in such sentence. The crux is, quotations must be orderly acknowledged. It is pertinent I equally respond to the reasons the author gave to suggest that my citation requirements are beyond bounds of what is necessary. First, "statements of fact that are common knowledge" should attract common literature backing, so citing such statement is not erroneous and should not be too demanding. More so, what you refer to as "statement of fact that are common knowledge" is relative. Authors' opinions and conjectural statement must be clearly stated as opinions and conjectures. Overall, if he is satisfied with his work, perhaps, considering his expertise, I go with him. Thanks.