



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_33420
Title of the Manuscript:	PERCEPTIONS ABOUT SOCIAL RESPONSIBLE INVESTING AMONG ACADEMIC STAFF: EVIDENCE FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST, 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The research methodology mentioned in the abstract was not consistent with the one mentioned in the "Material and Methods", since the research also employed SEM and Smart PLS. Therefore, both tools also need to be included in the abstract. 2. There are so many grammatical (in the Abstract, line 19, 69, and in other lines to the end of the paper) and typo errors especially which involves two words without space (line 26, 27, 31, 59, 60, 61, 62, 65, 68, and in many other lines towards the end). As such, proof reading is critically needed. 3. There is no citation for the discussion in the "Literature Review" from line 33 to 66. The author/s should mention the sources for the discussion. 4. There was no clear problem statement in this study. The author/s did not explain clearly why the perception of academic staff is significant for this study compared to businessmen since social responsible investing (SRI) issue is closer to the latter as investors. It's proven when around 50% of the respondents were not familiar with SRI all about. 5. Please amend confusing statements between line 106 and 116. 6. There's hanging sentence in line 119 to 121 that needs to be corrected. 7. Title "Research Methodology" is more appropriate for Topic 3 compared to "Material and Methods" which represent the content discussed. 8. It is also suggested that the sub-topics under Topic 3 as follows 3.1 Sampling (Above line 123) 3.2 Data Analysis (Replacing Structural Equation Modelling) 3.3 Measurement of Variables 9. Need proper introduction for "Environmental and Social Factors" (line 219). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEM and Smart PLS included in the abstract. 2. Proof reading done to correct errors. 3. Citations provided for the discussion in the "Literature Review" from line 33 to 66. 4. The last paragraph of page 2 reads....<i>In spite of the increasing realization of the power of investors to influence companies for the better service delivery, there is little evidence of the perception of investors about SRI among potential investors in Ghana. This pioneering work sought to fill the gap in literature by analysing the perception of potential investors, whether SRI is a criterion in making their investment decision. The choice of academics for the study was due to the perceived level of knowledge of academics on matters of environmental, social and governance. Besides, the income levels of these academics makes them potential investors</i> 5. Statements between line 106 and 116 amended. 6. Hanging sentence in line 119 to 121 corrected. 7. The use of research methodology, materials and methods amended to reflect the guidelines for authors by the Journal. 8. Topics and sub-topics in the paper amended and aligned to the Journal requirement and guidelines. 9. Introduction for "Environmental and Social Factors" amended. 10. Conclusion made in line 328 to 329 amended. 11. The justification was done within the context of academic staff of the University. We were careful in generalising this, although we may not be wrong in



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>10. The conclusion made in line 328 to 329 is not consistent with the result mentioned in Table 1, where not all male and female respondents giving negative response. The author/s also should specify clearly in a bracket the range of age for older generation to avoid confusion (line 329).</p> <p>11. In my opinion, inadequate research on SRI by the research community for not knowing the idea of SRI was not really justified (line 339-340) because there are numerous studies on this issue academically (about 161,000 results on social responsible investing found in Google Scholar). I believe the main reason for that is the lack of exposure of academic staff in the University of Cape Coast regarding the subject matter since not all academic staff have background or interest in business studies or business management. Therefore, strong justification is needed here.</p>	<p>making such generalisation within Ghana. Moreover, the 161,000 results on social responsible investing found in Google Scholar were not from Ghana, which justifies further, our study. Furthermore, one need not be a business or management person to know about SRI/CSR or investment. Investment is a habit.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>12. Some of the references are not complete – line 355, 367, and 390.</p> <p>13. The right margin in the “References” is not justified – starting from line 395 onwards.</p> <p>14. All tables title should be located at the centre not align left.</p> <p>15. Should use proper connector for the sentence in line 247.</p>	<p>12. References corrected. Meanwhile, Ellman, E. <i>The Canadian ethical money guide</i>. Lorrimer. 1996 is complete.</p> <p>13. References justified.</p> <p>14. All tables centred.</p> <p>15. Proper connector for the sentence in line 247 used.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Generally, this manuscript has a quite interesting topic. However, there are so many weaknesses in it which require the author/s to do corrections (as mentioned above) before it can be published as a journal article.</p>	