



SDI Review Form 1.6

Z

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_40844
Title of the Manuscript:	CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND INVESTMENT DECISIONS IN LISTED MANUFACTURING FIRMS IN NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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		
Minor REVISION comments	(1) Keywords... Remove semi colons and put instead commas between the words... (2) Line 24... change the word "discuss" to "discussion" (3) Lines 43 to46 need re-arranegment, message is clear if you remove ... that the parties till etc... (4) Line52, change "were" to "where" (5) Line 65, Shiller (998) defines... (6) Line 168, extent a general... (7) Line 172, last words change to ... on their need (8) Line 194, add comma to reference. (9) Line 227 add "a nd between references (10) Discuss what software was used in the data analysis.... Add it in Methodology... even if mentioned under Table 1 (11) Line 244, express the equation clearly to show <i>subscripts</i>... (12) Same in the definition of words in Lines 247, 248 and 249. (13) Line 260 define (1-t) (14) Section 3.2 is a repetition... Remove lines 277-282. And just write: For the purpose of this study, the three hypotheses generated from the review of literature are used. These were depicted in section 2.3.1 (15) Rearrange Table 1 and its title. (16) Line 288 What is table 1.0???? (17) Lines 295, 297 and 299 add a comma before respectively. (18) Line 319, use capital letter for Table and write Table 2 instead of the table ... (19) Line 341 write The result in Table 4 shows... (20) Line 347 end of phrase... write is explained by the variations of the independent variables..... (21) Line 350, write depicted in Table 4 indicate.... (22) Line 352 while discussing the results... STC and EMB are not statistically	(1)—corrected (2)—corrected (3)—corrected (4)—corrected (5)—corrected (6)—corrected (7)—corrected (line 171) (8)—no reference on line 194 (9)—the list of references present here doesn't cover all the researchers who have that same view hence no 'and' there (10)—corrected (line 233) (11)—corrected (12)—corrected (line 243, 244, 245, 246) (13)—corrected (line 265) (14)—corrected (15)—corrected (16)—corrected (17)—corrected (line 292, 293, 295) (18)—corrected (line 310) (19)—corrected (line 331) (20)—corrected (line 337-338) (21)—corrected (line 340) (22)—it is well accounted for in their individual hypothesis interpretations



SDI Review Form 1.6

	significant??? Account for that... (23) Lines 389 and 390, clarify that the statement ... which says that there is no significant relationship is the Null hypothesis not the alternate..... If you read the 2 lines it shows something else... (24) Line 397.... Add but statistically insignificant relationship (25) Review the references style to match the journal citation requirement style.	under hypotheses testing (23)-- It is the null hypothesis (24)—corrected (line 387) (25)-- corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Good Paper	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>