



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_21678
Title of the Manuscript:	Identifying the impact of spiritual leadership on organizational citizenship behavior in the Iranian healthcare industry
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	The ms lacks signed informed consent and Ethics Committee approval of the study. There is a great unbalance in the literature cited and the use of cites in the text: there are 41 cites in Introduction and 4 in Discussion, it seems that authors did not contrast their results with those obtained by other authors. Results are over expressed, i.e., there is no need of showing all statistics, each in different tables, increasing the length of the paper.	1. We really appreciate mentioning these valuable comments. This is to inform you that, current study has not been funded by any organization and the authors are responsible and have funded for conducting this current research such as data collection and etc. 2. For the case of number of citations, all of the references numbers are 41 and in the discussion, we only have compared the results of current study with those studies which have been reviewed in the part of "SL and OCB". (Two reviewed studies in the literature review part, reference numbers 8 and 9). This is to inform you the two other references are related to research model which are reference numbers 4 and 7. 3. For the case of results, as long as we had to support evidence for conclusion part. We tried our best to clarify the procedure of data



SDI Review Form 1.6

		processing for readers step by step. We agree with you that we have explained everything in details. But the main reason is clarification and supporting our findings. Another reason was related to different statistical tests and number of dimensions and variables. As you see there are two variables with twelve dimensions. The research model was adapted from two valid scales and we can say that it is a comprehensive research model. In addition, in the factor analysis test, we tried our best to summarize information and we only brought Bartlett's test information. Finally, you are totally right. The results of this study are in line with previous studies as compared in discussion section.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		