



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_25822
Title of the Manuscript:	The influence of rewards on employees performance
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>)

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		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Objective - Objective of study to address on qualitative approach was not given - It was mentioned in the methodology to include both qualitative and quantitative Methodology - The validity and reliability of self design questionnaire was not addressed - Since this the instrument is new did the pre test and pilot test has been conducted – need to be explained - The operation definition of the variable should be explained - Examining the items for each dimension – it was found some items are redundant - The data analysis was not explain in the methodology. What type of analysis is it correlation? - The above is on quantitative	I intended to say that the findings of relevant research and studies carried out on this issue will be used to support the decision of either acceptance or rejection of stated hypotheses. The methodology used is that, once the decision is made to accept or reject hypotheses based on correlation analysis of variables, then findings of relevant research and studies will be stated if in favor with the results of the current study and furthermore, findings of relevant research and studies will be stated if against. Based on that the qualitative approach will be replaced by the above intention. Regarding the validity and reliability of self design questionnaire was insured by referring the questionnaire to specialists. Redundant items of stated dimensions will be removed. The data analysis was based on correlation coefficients as shown in the tables. Attempt is made to combine the result of correlation in one table. The determination of the relationship as strong is indicated through the results of correlation between dependent and independent variables and as seen in the accompanied tables, through the comparison of calculated and table values. Regarding some old references, they were regarded as valuable studies that should not be neglected. The reason why pilot study is conducted is that, the study population was large and the circumstances of their work made access to them difficult. Regarding pilot study reliability was high and served its purpose . later greater number of respondents were taken to fill in the questionnaires.
---------------------------------------	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- What about qualitative – the methodology was not explained Results - Results on qualitative was not given - Tabulation on regression results may be improved- it should report the beta value, the r square value and the significant value. - the interpretation of data should reflect what it supposed to explain. - The result of correlation would be better be tabulated in one table Recommendation: Under recommendation the following sentence was given: <u>“Since the relationship between rewards and employees performance is considered as strong, then that should alarm management to be more committed regarding the setting of appropriate incentive plans because that will encourage employees to be more purposeful and hence increase their performance”</u> How you determine the relationship as strong? What are the indicators? References: Some are old eg 1964	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		
---	--	--