



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_56622
Title of the Manuscript:	REWARD SYSTEMS AND ITS PERFORMANCE IMPLICATION: A SOUTH EASTERN NIGERIA EXPERIENCE
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	<p>The broad objective of the paper Reward Systems and its Performance Implication: A South Eastern Nigeria Experience "is to examine the impact of non-financial rewards on job performance of civil servants in South East of Nigeria.</p> <p>The broad objective is deployed into two following specific objectives: (1) Examine the impact of employee recognition (first non-financial reward) on job performance of civil servants in South East of Nigeria; and (2) Appraise the impact of staff development (second) non-financial reward) on employee job performance of civil servants in South East of Nigeria.</p> <p>The following Hypotheses (1) and (2) are respectively linked to the specific objectives: (1) There is no significant relationship between employee recognition and performance in civil service in South East of Nigeria; and (2) There is no significant relationship between staff development and employee performance in civil service in South East of Nigeria.</p> <p>"Data were collected using structured questionnaire ...". However this questionnaire and its respective methods of elaboration were not presented in the article. It is really important to show these data in this paper. This is the first compulsory change for improving this paper.</p> <p>The three research concepts of the paper are Employee Recognition, Staff Development and Job Performance were dealt with in the literature review. However, the main aspects of these concepts, i. e. research variables, were neither highlighted in the literature nor linked to the elaboration of the structured questionnaire. These actions have to done. This is the second compulsory change for improving this paper.</p> <p>The main conclusions of this article are: (1) that "there is a statistical significant relationship between employee recognition and performance in civil service in South East of Nigeria"; and (2) "that positive and significant relationship exists between employee performance and staff development in civil service". The results are important in terms of particularity and locality, but they could be enriched by preparing something like a research map. Most of similar quantitative pieces of research regarding "impact of non-financial rewards on job performance", conducted worldwide, could be presented in temporal and local terms. Some of them were presented, but it is important to show that the author(s) have done a historical and worldwide investigation. It is also relevant to point out the main aspects, i. e. research variables, linked to the three research concepts of the paper are Employee Recognition, Staff Development and Job Performance which were used in previous similar publications. This is the third compulsory change for improving this paper.</p> <p>The fourth compulsory change is to do the test of normality of the data because data that do not follow normal distribution not cannot use Pearson's correlation. Thus, the two main conclusions of this paper cannot be considered valid.</p> <p>"The population of the study was 26,741 civil servants". "A sample size of 5136 was used in the descriptive survey". The fifth compulsory change is to present a description of the profiles of the respondents, with professional position and respective length of stay, sex and age. The discrimination of data may open room help for new contributions to the article.</p> <p>Furthermore, as the sixth compulsory change the author(s) have to show how they have reached 5136 respondents, for instance, through e-mail or personally. Data collection methods must be presented, as well as how long the author(s) spend to it get this quantity of answers. Did they interview the respondents personally? What was the data collection procedure? When was the questionnaire applied?</p> <p>The seventh compulsory change is to improve the references. Reference Borg and Gall is incomplete. Their method could be described, or the author(s) could include a paper which contains this method. There could be more updated and relevant references, mainly regarding the third compulsory change. The methods for bibliographic search would enrich this paper.</p> <p>I congratulate the author(s) for the relevant theme of this article. Nevertheless it is compulsory to join efforts to accomplish the previous compulsory changes.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fernando César Almada Santos
Department, University & Country	University of São Paulo, Brazil