



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_25527
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF TRUCK DRIVERS' LITERACY AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IN HAULAGE OPERATIONS 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	Abstract: - Not appropriate Introduction: - What is the purpose of research? - What is the problem of research or research question? - What will the research bring in terms of novelty? - Problem of "consistent" writing (uncorrelated content) - In line 92-93: ..." A researcher found - 93 out that keeping to 80km/h speed reduces fuel..." - which researcher - Lines from 99 to 133 are unnecessary - There is inadequate Literature Review In Material and methods, the authors should consider the following: - Missing: Conceptual framework, hypothesis development, and survey - The tools that were used in the analysis should be given and described. - The procedure and steps of the analysis should be explained. - This is the part where demographical features of the sample should be described. - Line 151-168 should be described (in text)	The abstract has been re-modified to reflect the objectives of the study, the methodology, findings, conclusion and recommendations of the research. The purpose has reflected from the new abstract is to assess the level of truck driver's literacy and to determine the effects of literacy on operational performance of truck drivers in haulage industry in Nigeria. Line 92-93 has been appropriately replaced Lines 99 to 133 have been removed Relevant literatures have been added. Conceptual framework has been added. We appreciate your insightful comments which no doubt has improved the quality of this research. However, we believe ANOVA is used to test for a difference in more than two independent means.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	In the Results section, the authors should consider the following: - The first thing is a table????, followed with some explanation of known statistical definitions – why? - In line 191....”then we accept the NULL HYPOTHESIS – where is this Hypothesis - The author should conduct ANOVA analysis to identify differences between groups (higher or lower qualification) Why SUMMARY at the end? Conclusion is inappropriate. Plagiarism Issues: Tested with Plagiarism X . Some part are just copied from other sources (e.i. “.....explanations of risks and subsequent accidents (Savage, 1989).....«	Here, we are assessing literate drivers and illiterate ones. Therefore, we are of the opinion that comparative analytical technique is suitable. Summary has been appropriately removed. (Salvage,1989)... has been removed
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- There are many grammatical errors. - It is advised that a native speaker proofreads the paper before publishing.	Editorials may deem it fit to proofread for corrections regarding grammatical, semantics among other errors. We appreciate the constructive observations raised. Sincerely, all these added to the quality of this research. Good to have you among reviewers.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		