



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_8425
Title of the Manuscript:	Monitoring Recruitment and Selection Practice: A Therapeutic Strategy for Quality Service Delivery in Nigeria Public Universities
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Author to update article to reflect recent developments in university system in Nigeria. 2. Author to clearly state objectives of the article and methodology used in data collection and analysis. 3. Author to provide empirical evidences for breach of recruitment and selection procedures in universities. 4. Author to provide sources of key statements in the article e.g. lines 142 – 152 and lnes 166 – 192. 5. Author should limit his discussion on the recruitment and selection of lecturers without mixing it with that of the Non-academic workers. 6. Author should critically review recruitment and selection guidelines of at least five (5) universities and show evidence of how the guidelines have been flouted. Or Author should take one of the universities as a case study for critical review of its guidelines. 7. Author should take cognisance of the university as an autonomous entity with its approved conditions of service and the roles of NUC vis-a-vis FMoE in university system in making recommendations regarding recruitment, selection and monitoring. 8. Author should discuss University Service Charter and describe the extent of service delivery or otherwise in order to justify any "Therapeutic Strategy" recommended. 9. Author should review more published journal articles (which are available online) on the topic to enrich the quality of the paper.	1. One of the few recent developments in university system in Nigeria is included in overview of public university and funding (2.1). 2. The general objective of the article is shown in the abstract and methodology in separate heading before conclusions. 3. Observed practices in some universities in Nigeria show deviations from standard recruitment and selection procedures given in literature. 4. Relevant authors were cited where necessary. 5. Non-academic staff were removed from the work. 6. The practice is noticeable in several Nigerian universities. 7. The recommendations may be useful to all Nigerian universities despites the autonomous entity condition. 8. Actual service reports of individual universities were not available at the time of this work. The paper relied on observations in some Nigerian universities as well as literature review. 9. More journal articles and other published work were reviewed



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Line 71: He added that..... WHO ADDED? 2. Line 83: He explained the term..... WHO EXPLAINED? 3. Note that "Edicts" are state's laws while Federal has "Acts".	1. Correction effected accordingly 2. Correction effected accordingly 3. Correction effected accordingly
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. There is need for some editorial review. 2. The references listed have made the article extremely weak for academic paper. 3. Author should refrain from exhibiting sentiment in the article.	