



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_34882
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on Defense Strategies of Listed Companies under Hostile Takeover: A Case of Battle for Equity between Baoneng Group and Vanke
Type of the Article	Case Study

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	(1) All in-text references should be in square brackets [1] and not exponential style or superscript style, example ^[1]. (2) Paper looks to me as a case study, but it does not follow the suggested journal recommendation of subtitles. (3) There is no consent paragraph to use the case details! (4) The list of references do not abide exactly the recommended style. Needs revision. (5) In the literature review part, author(s) should not use full neames rather last names only (First paragraph) (6) Walking (1988) is not in Ref list. (7) Epstein is not in Ref list. (8) Methods of Company acquisition must be supported by a Reference or more. (9) section 3.2.2 According to Coase! Not referenced. (10) Tables have no Sources... ex. Table 1, (11) Figure 2 should be 1, and has no source. (12) Case description has no references. (13) First paragraph after figure 2, has a referencing style not consistent to the intext ref before! (14) Figure 3 should be 2 and has no source. (15) First paragraph after figure 3 has no reference to the stated information. (16) Section 4.2.3, (1), needs reference. (17) Point (5) needs ref.	(1) All the format requirements have been met after the revision. (2) This paper is a case study, and the subtitle has been changed as recommend. (3) All the data and information quoted are from Vanke, Baoneng, China Securities Regulatory Commission and Shenzhen Stock Exchange's public disclosed information. It's permitted by all relevant companies. And The "COMPETING INTERESTS" paragraph has been added. (4) All lacking refs, such as Walking (1988), have been added. (5) The sources of all tables and figures have been added. (6) The NO. of the figures has been corrected. (7) The limitations and implications on policy making is added. Thanks for your comment!



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(18) Paper needs to state limitations and implications on Policy making.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		