



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_39339
Title of the Manuscript:	Corporate Green CSR/CSE Management based on a Metadata Analysis
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Literature review is too brief. There are no crucial books, papers. It is mostly composed of the electronic sources and links. I miss the discussion with alternative sources and important authors. I miss the definition of ETF. What is a „GASL bull 3x ETF“ – explanation.	According to your remarks, eight (8) additional citations/references regarding corporate green governance, CSR and green management have been added to the manuscript. So, the Reference Section now supported by 30 references. Also, explanations for both the “ETF” term and the trading instrument “GASL 3x ETF” have been added in manuscript text and in Notes Section at the end of the manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The paper is too complicated, not very clear and hard for reading. Some terms are not explained. I would recommend to accommodate the style to be more “reader friendly”.	After the adoption of your proposed explanations (in both manuscript's main text and in Notes Section), paper's style is more friendly and readable.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		