



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1) This article works off an assumption (or bias) that all readers have a common knowledge. For example in line 30, and then again in line 166, "relevant labour unions" are mentioned. The question is which? Academic Staff Union of Universities? Are there others since this is plural? Similarly in line 33 "targeted funding" is mentioned but never detailed. How is this being defined? 2) This assumption carried down to line 190-192, 169-170, 182-183 where it is considered accepted that declining quality has increased corrupt practices. An additional example may help to solidify this argument.	1. There was no assumption or bias, the knowledge of what ought to be was developed from secondary data gathered through literature review and observations in the university system. Union is used. Targeted funding here refers to improvement in education (university) funding as mentioned in this work. It was not necessary to detailed it more since funding is not a major variable in this work. 2. In this work, increased corruption was said to lead to declining quality of service delivery, not the way the Assessor commented here. Sexual harassment was also mentioned as outcome of unmonitored recruitment and selection practice.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) In lines 160-162 it seems that the hiring process is considered worthy since those that pass are able to do so proudly and seem to make commendable contributions. However, the article also states that selection needs to be revamped in the first two recommendations. How can these two items be reconciled? 2) The recommendations are logical given the article content. However, justification for particulars would be	1. Unmonitored recruitment and selection practice was not considered worthy. Relevant recommendations made here have shown worthy approaches. 2. University system to have more academic staff than non-academic staff (i.e. one non-academic staff to three academic staff).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	useful. For example, in line 270 it is mentioned that an appropriate ratio is 1:3. However, this ratio is not explained adequately.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1) In lines 136-140 the author references minimal attention to attracting quality staff. Is it possible that the increased funding will lead to the ability of a University to secure top talent or are these two items mutually exclusive? 2) The author mentioned the creation of several monitoring committees but the relatively recent creation of committees should at least be touched upon. Articles as recent as January 9th reference the Implementation Monitoring Committee (December 2013) based on the Needs Assessment Report. Will this solve problems raised here? What about the Technical and Logistics Committees? The items raised in this review, if addressed, will help to ensure that the article can act as a stand-alone document and omit some potential bias.	1. This work is not against increased funding, but increased funding without monitored recruitment and selection procedures will not positively affect quality service delivery in public universities. This work contains this assertion. 2. None of the committees mentioned by the Assessor adopts the monitoring process recommended in this work