



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_13864
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATING PERFORMANCE OF CHEST DISEASES DEPARTMENTS USING HOSPITAL EFFICIENCY INDICATORS IN TURKEY
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	The manuscript is important and has much strength. Section 1: It is unclear what the novelty of this paper. Section 2: The general quality of the written English language is poor. Numerous sentences are incomplete and the meaning of phrases is often not understood. Past and present tense are used disorderly. Revision by a native speaker is highly recommended. Section 3: discussion needed literature review for support study, please rewritten. Section 8: Conclusion in this study not clear, please check Section 9: Recommendations should be included in discussion. Section 10 : Line 149 ref. Nawata et al., 2009, please check Section 11: Line 155 ref. Klein et al., 2001 ,please check years Section 12: Line 158 ref. Tekin 2011, ,please check Section 13: All ref. please check written.	General quality of the written English is not poor. There were grammatical errors and they have been corrected in accordance with the other referee's feedbacks. Some of the comments have been cleared using one of the referee's inputs. Conclusions and recommendations sections have been re-structured and written. It is more specific now. All references have been checked and corrections have been made.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		