



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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• The sample is too small to obtain robust conclusions. The author only has 5 companies with a very small response rate (53.3% and in one case 37.5). I don't know how but the author should improve this. • Moreover, there is a non-response sample bias that should be considered including two steps estimation. • The author should better explain the results of principal components analysis since they are the base of the following study. A table for the results should be a good idea explaining the relationship between variables and factors • The model only explains 33% of the variance (model R2) in employee innovative work behaviour (page 9). Does the author have any hypothesis of what could explain the remaining 66%? • You have five dimensions of employees' HR satisfaction but you only find a significant relationship with one. Do you think that is enough to support H1? What does it happen with training, remuneration, job security and public relations? Don't they have any influence on innovative behaviour or it is because of the small sample? Explain this	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	National University of Distance Education, Spain