



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_47701
Title of the Manuscript:	Employee welfare package and its impact on productivity (A case study of Roesons Industries Ltd Enugu-Ukwu, Anambra state, Nigeria)
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1) Aims of study has to be explained in detail. Research gap is not clear. Explain research problem. 2) Ho: Employee welfare package does not in any way affect productivity How do you measure employees' productivity? It is not clear. 3) Ho: There is no significant relationship between motivation and productivity. Cannot find results for this hypothesis. Do you test Motivation? How? 4) Motivation cannot find in the literature survey. 5) As you use total population as a sample better to preset as a case study. Because you might not be able to generalized the results. 6) Methodology has to present with more detail. 7) Discussion part is missing. 8) Do you have any recommendations?	1. The aim of the study is clear and well expressed 2. The hypothesis has been reconfigured 3. There is some analysis and results for hypothesis two 4. My total population as a sample was presentesnted based on the case study (Roeson's Industries Ltd). It was not generalized. 5. The hypothesis were well discussed after each hypothesis analysis 6. The results has been recommended
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	