



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_36054
Title of the Manuscript:	HETEROGENEITY AND DIFFERENTIATION OF JOB SATISFACTION DETERMINANTS: EVIDENCE FROM PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN GHANA
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. The reasons why the author choose the questions to develop the questionnaire should be explained in detail, because this is the basis of the index of the determinants. 2. I doubted that in the equation (3) , why Z and $D \cdot X_j$ are both included? to my understanding, Dummy variables are enough to investigate the differential effect. 3. How can the Table 2 be concluded? The paper should explain. 4. According to Table4, there is no differential effect between male and female(because non-significant), but in 4.5.1, the author discuss the heterogeneity, and I have doubt about this. 5. Analysis in 4.5 has no references to support the author's viewpoints. 6. There is no references of recent three years.	1. Line 52 to 64 provide the reasons of the research, it is the same reasons that motivates us in developing the questionnaire. Line 148-149 further explained how the questionnaire was developed and we have included line 149-151. 2. When we are estimating heterogeneity of gender, then gender would not be part of Z since it has already being interacted with the choice variable we want to examined. However, age, academic qualification etc. all would be part of Z. Similar explanation holds for heterogeneity analysis for marital status, academic qualification etc. Dummy variable can only tells us the difference in terms of job satisfaction but cannot tell us (for example, whether remuneration give male different job satisfaction from females). 3. Explained in line 270-275 4. A dummy does not explain heterogeneity of a particular covariate on job satisfaction, it only explains whether men are more satisfied than women but it does not explain whether there are differences in remuneration of men or remuneration of women affecting job satisfaction. We have already explain the interpretation of the dummies in Table 4 in line 336-353 5. Linked with previous studies inserted, Check lines 408, 409 & 459 6. Although we agree that there is not much references in the last three years, there are still some. Example are the references in line 499 and 528
yMinor REVISION comments	1."q" in the formula of index X (1) should be g? 2. In Table 1, the number 556 is inconformity with that in 4.1 (558,524), and 408 plus 116 not equals 556 but 524, the same is 213 plus 311. 3. There is no 4.3 and 4.4, but 4.2 directly to 4.5. 4. There are some language errors in the paper and they should be corrected.	1. Effected the change 2. Effected the change 3. Have made the corrections 4. We have read through the documents and improved the writing.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		For interpretation of an explanatory variable which is a dummy, the explanation can be found in Jeffrey wooldridge book "introductory econometrics: a modern approach 5th edition chapter 7. For the model specification on heterogeneity, there are several articles in economics. Two specific examples are: 1. Powell-Jackson ,T., Hanson, K. Whitty J. M. C., & Ansah, K. (2014). who benefit from free health care: Evidence of randomized control experiment in Ghana. Journal of Development Economics 107(2014), 305\319 2. McCrary, J., & Royer, H. (2011). The effect of female education on fertility and infant health: Evidence from school entry policies using exact date of birth. <i>American Economic Review</i>. http://doi.org/10.1257/aer.101.1.158
---	--	---