



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
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>)



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	<p>-The title of the manuscript should be checked and revised as it seems to have missing words.</p> <p>- Introduction should be improved in order to provide a more robust theoretical background for the research topic.</p> <p>- The reason why the researchers select these study variables should be provided in a clear manner.</p> <p>- In Methodology, it says “ the second section was further subdivided into 2 sub-sections each posing a set of questions in relation to each of the study's research objectives as shown in table 1”; however, Table 1 shows the Regression Model with no evident understanding of such two sub-sections.</p> <p>- In Methodology, the Likert scale used should be explained with more details. For instance, did the researchers develop the questionnaire items? Was there a statistical analysis of reliability and validity of those items? The Reliability and Validity section only presents the description of these concepts, but not the relevant data.</p> <p>- In Discussion, it says “five main factors were identified” and “five main potential factors were identified. The researchers should explain the difference between “main factors” and “main potential” factors. Furthermore, do these factors have an effect</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title has been corrected 2. 6 Theoretical backing is included in the study (also a the table in the methodology 3. Reason has been stated clearly in the study 4. The table has been labelled table 3.1. and included in the study 5. It has been made clear in the study that the researcher developed the questionnaire to follow the research objective. On each regression model and analysis, the level of reliability at 95% is clearly stated 6. “five main potential factors were identified” was used as a mistake and have been corrected. For this study, on five factors were identified and analysed. The factors are clearly stated in the paragraph



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>on employees' attitude toward performance appraisal or on employee performance or employee motivation? Is there a difference in their effects on performance and motivation?</p> <p>- In Results and Discussion, there is not any information about the perceptions of HR manager and employees. What is the result of the interviews with managers? Was there a comparison or a difference? There is also no detail whether the study results differ from other sectors as the study was conducted in IT sector. Are the findings similar or are there any results specific to IT sector?</p>	<p>7.The perception of the HR manager has been analysed and compared with the result of the quantitative analysis and also compared with existing literature in the field.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>- Language of the manuscript is not easy to read. The whole manuscript should be checked and revised in order to enable the reader to understand easily.</p> <p>- The organizational implications of the study findings should be improved beyond just expressing the factors identified, and more solid recommendations should be made</p>	<p>1. Some grammatical errors have been corrected and changes made</p> <p>2.The recommendation have been improved</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>- The manuscript should be restructured in order to provide a better understanding of its content and findings.</p>	<p>The structure followed was consistent with the requirement of the Journal</p>