



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_44593
Title of the Manuscript:	THE ROLE OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE IN DETERMINING ACADEMICIANS' ORGANIZATIONAL LOYALTY
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	1. Improve the writing style and the content of the manuscript. 2. The abstract is quite lengthy. It needs to be short and sweet, but contains all the required information. 3. In the introduction section, there is an effort to justify the need for the study or the problem statement. However, the claims were not supported with the most recent research evidence in the area. 4. The justification for the selection of the two universities is not well made. Highlight what happens in the universities that trigger this study to be conducted. 5. The hypotheses should be written in the form of research hypotheses not null hypotheses. They should be placed after the discussion on their relationships. 6. The identification of the variables was not well discussed. Suddenly, the four factors were selected without proper justification or theories or models that serve as a basis for selection. 7. The significance of the study should be made by focusing on managerial and research implications, not on what the researcher would personally obtain or learn. And, they should be placed toward the end of the manuscript. 8. In the methodology section, provide a sampled item for each factor and report the Cronbach's alpha values for each factor (not as a whole) as found by previous researchers. 9. In the findings' section, you need to know what information should be presented and what should not. Mean and standard deviation values are missing. Cronbach's alpha values are also missing. The use of abbreviations is not explained. The information must be presented in the correct way. Refer to any journal article to know how authors present the findings of the study. 10. In the discussion section, some of the reasons or justifications of for the findings are not appropriate. The reasons must be related to the findings. For example, how do you know that the staff are dissatisfied with leadership? 11. Only three articles dated 2013 were referred to. Others are more than five years old. Since this topic is common, there are a lot of published articles that can be referred to. Please update references.	
Minor REVISION comments	1. The manuscript contains a lot of grammatical errors. Please proofread it. 2. The in-text citations are not following the right format. Check for the right format and improve the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	1. The manuscript should be revised thoroughly to make it publishable.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Abdul Kadir Othman</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia</i>