



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_34044
Title of the Manuscript:	Examining Employees' Attitudes Performance Appraisal and its Impact on Performance and Motivation in a UK Information Technology (IT) Firm
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>)

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		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>I would like the author to consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I suggest that the hypotheses for the study be clearly stated. 2. A crosscheck of referencing. For instance, Naricesse and Harcourt (2008) is not in the list of references. 3. Author may want to give a reason or two to support why a sample size of 45 was chosen. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Research hypothesis was not relevant in the study because it was an exploratory study and no pre-conceived hypothesis was tested. 2. References have been cross-checked 3. We have included in the study that all employees of the company (45) were our sample size.