



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_9272
Title of the Manuscript:	An Exploratory Analysis of Demographic, Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factors as Determinants of Job Satisfaction Level of a Conservation Agency's Employees in 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>)



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	1. The sampling procedure is flawed and unscientific. Which sampling method was used to determine the sample size of 231? 2. The hypotheses being tested are not given. The results of hypotheses testing can only be assumed to be imaginary since they are not provided in this work. 3. Therefore the appropriateness of the tests of hypotheses is questionable since it is not know which ones are being tested. What warrants the use of t-test, multiple regression and Pearson correlation tests.? 4. Even if the tests were to be true, the results are not clearly explained- especially the meaning and interpretation of the regression results. It means that the decisions to reject or accept the hypotheses is cannot hold in these cases. 5. It follows that even the conclusions are not based on the actual results since the analyses are questionable	1. Nothing unscientific in the sample size. The minimum scientifically acceptable sample size for any population understudy is 10%. See line 128-129 in the manuscript. 2. Hypotheses were clearly stated in the manuscript. See line 110-115. 3. See line 177-181 in the manuscript 4. See line 280-288, line 322-344 in the manuscript. 5. See line 413-417 in the manuscript
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		