



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_42902
Title of the Manuscript:	EQUITY PERCEPTION AND JOB SATISFACTION OF CIVIL SERVANTS IN THE NORTH-EAST NIGERIA: THE MEDIATING ROLE OF SELF-EFFICACY
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Authors should state the hypothesis of the study at Introduction rather than empirical review Instead of telling readers about the software used for data analysis, it is rather better to tell readers about the method for analysis eg. descriptive (mean, frequencies etc.) inferential analysis (eg linear regression, probit, anova, etc) Under Each table, Source should be researchers survey but not SPSS It is not clear; how interesting outliers can be found in a close ended questionnaire. the author should therefore explain how this occurs. Exogenous and Endogenous variables not appropriately used in line 508	i. We disagree with this suggestion that the hypotheses of the study to be stated in the introduction instead of literature and hypothesis development section. Technically and logically, hypotheses are stated after stating the arguments and empirically supported. ii. With regards to methods of data analysis used, we have explicitly explained that in the content of the methodology. For instance, we said '----- descriptive statistics analysis as well as the data cleaning and management----'(see lines 329 – 332.) iii. Source of each table has been corrected as suggested. iv. Also, with regards to interesting outliers, as stated in the content of the paper having treated the entry or error outliers we further notice some outliers and we observed that they valuable data points because they contain knowledge from the respondents. Hence, we termed them as interesting outliers. v. We are requesting the reviewer to explain further. Because, we refer to exogenous variable as the independent variable of the study (i.e. equity perception). While, the endogenous variable as the dependent variable (i.e. job satisfaction).
Minor REVISION comments	Definition of equity perception in line 53 & 54 must be redefine to be clearer. Last but on word in line 83 supposed to be scarce Revise the sentence in line 111 and 112 The 3rd word in line 301 should be employed or adopted rather than was Line 308, it supposed to be out of	i. The definition of equity perception has been redefined as suggested (see lines 52 – 55). ii. The word <i>scare</i> was replaced with <i>scarce</i> as observed (see line 84). iii. The sentence in lines 111 – 112 has been revised as suggested (see lines 110 - 112). iv. The word <i>employed</i> replaced <i>was</i> as suggested (see line 302). v. The word <i>of</i> was inserted as observed (see line 309).
Optional/General comments	Sub heading should be provided. Example 4.1 Preliminary analysis	i. Second tier heading were inserted in all sub-headings under the results and discussion section as suggested.