



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>)

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- Use either USA or UK English. 2- Line 203: mixed results, however, in the literature mentioned I did not notice mixed results, instead only positive trend between CSR and performance. 3- Define the numbers in table 1, are they log or values. If they are values please define currency. Otherwise insert values as descriptive. 4- In line 389: "null hyp is not rejected" is more accurate than "null hyp is accepted" please modify accordingly. 5- Recommendations here are meant to be "further research" rather than recommendation.	(1)—corrected (2)—corrected in the empirical table at line 193 (3) they're defined in the methodology already (4) corrected (5)corrected
Minor REVISION comments	1- Equation in line 244: use equation editor and equation numbering. 2- No need to repeat hypotheses again in section 3.2. 3- Use either SH or INVD, I think they are used to mean same thing. 4- Revise references according to one manner (see commas, dots...) 5- Lines 258/359: the results of the study "are" not "is"	(1) Corrected (2) Corrected (3) Was used interchangeably since they mean same thing in this study (4) Corrected (5) corrected
Optional/General comments	I suggest 2 things to improve the paper. 1- Use other control variables such as, firm age and size or the type of investors.... 2- In light of these findings that investment is significantly positively related to only donation but not to training and benefits; I suggest that you look at explanations such as internal and external CSR actions because DON is external but others are only internal, so this shows that CSR actions directed to external society are more visible thus more positively values by investors	(1) the independent variables applied for this study properly explains the dependent variable (investment decisions), hence no need to focus on a particular type of investor or apply control variables. This recommendation was applied under further recommendations for research. (2) corrected and applied (line 410-413)

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>