

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_43948
Title of the Manuscript:	Cultural Dynamics and Performance Family Owned Businesses in Anambra State
Type of the Article	This is Not a Case study ; Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agree highlight that part in the man
	[4] Abote at Line 44 write Duringerees in Anomhra	his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	[1] Abstract, Line 11, write Businesses in Anambra	
	[2] Line 13, writedistribution of questionnaires in	
	[3] Keywords [one word], Keywords	
	[4] Line 34, write and/or structures.	
	[5] Line 122, ckose quotation marks and notions of time".	
	[6] Line 201, write combinations may exist	
	[7] Line 225, write Wade & Ricardo (2001) opine that	
	[8] Line 247, write However, this significant	
	[9] Line 258, writefinancial analysts	
	[10] Line 279, write These were among	
	[11] Line 287, write for various components or	
	[12] Line 291, write individual units which	
	[13] Line 331, write very different cultures and	
	[14] Line 335, write attributes were shown	
	[15] Line 338, write questionnaires were	
	[16] Line 381, write through a questionnaire from	
	[17] Line 391, write formula as: $N / [1 + Ne^2]$	
	[18] Line 398, write of questionnaires in	
	[19] Line 412, write copies of the questionnaire	
	[20] Line 416, write which represent a response rate of 83% of	
	[21] Lines 420 - 421, write acceptance of 0.70	
	[22] Which software was used?????	
	[23] All Table Titles are straight not Italic: Line 428, Table 1: Distribution of Responses	
	Line 435, Table 2: PPMCC Output	
	[24] Lines 431 -433 Analysis is not enough. You need to do it in detail	

eed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and anuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write

SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6



[25] Explain Table 2 in the paragraph under the Table
[26] Analysis of data is very limited You need to do other tests using regression analysis using the items in Table 1
[27] Lines 445-446, you can not just infer that, where is the proof?? The obtained results of Table 2 is not enough for inference
[28] Lines 455 – 460 You need more data to discuss that If you do regressions analysis between the items in your Table 1, you may be able to infer further.
[29] What are the limitations of the research?
[30] Recommendations must be based on a thorough analysis of the findindins which you do not have???
[31] What are the implications??
[32] You have references cited in your list of references but are not in your text, must remove Line 505
Line 542
Line 560
Line 567
Line 595
[33] You have references cited in your text but not in your List of references:
Line 50
Line 58
Line 68
Line 121
Line 133
Line 135
Line 178
Line 190
Line 224 & 225
Line 233
Line 240
Line 286

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

		I
	Line 365	
	[34] You need to correct the reference Miller, Steier & LeBreton-Miller, 2003.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	This is not a Case Study, otherwise a selection of a family Business is a must and to be analyzed in the paper based on the review of literature and a selection of several attributes, or key success factors.	
	In general, a good and attractive subject. The author followed well the stages for research review process, with good literature review and secondary data support [needing at least 40 references, having 47 references]. However, the quantitative analysis is poor and more can be done therefore the conclusions are not well supported.	
	If the quantitative analysis is performed more deeply, then this paper will contribute to the existent literature and adds value-added knowledge to both policy makers and researchers.	
	Further the author must put more attention to add the implications to family businesses, the economic sector, and government policy	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hussin Jose Hejase
Department, University & Country	Al Maaref University, Lebanon

