

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_100857
Title of the Manuscript:	Foreign Direct Investment in The Sub-Saharan Africa: Unveiling The Pains and Gains of Domestic Firms
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Is, it is.</p> <p>Is, it is.</p> <p>Is, it is.</p> <p>Adjustments are needed.</p> <p>Yes, I do.</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There is a need for a rigorous spelling revision,</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article addresses a relevant research problem but needs corrections for publication. There is a need for a rigorous spelling revision, The introduction needs to be rewritten so that it clearly addresses the research problem, the contribution of the paper, the objectives in running text form, and tells how the paper is structured.</p> <p>Write a text between tables 1 and 2, not two consecutive tables with no text between them. Furthermore, table 2 contains information that has not been properly explained. What each column means, for example.</p> <p>The conclusions, on the other hand, need to be placed with great caution given the fragility of the methodology used. One cannot be emphatic in the statements made because the methodology used does not allow it. Thus, it is necessary to put it in a softer way.</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wellington Ribeiro Justo
Department, University & Country	Regional University of Cariri, Federal University of Pernambuco, Brazil