

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_127481
Title of the Manuscript:	Nexus between Corporate Social Responsibility and Corporate Financial Performance: An Empirical Evaluation
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript raises an important issue regarding the potential of SR towards improving firm performance. However, the following issues limit its significance and rigour. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is a known fact that the relationship between CSR and financial performance is inconclusive. The real reason behind the divergence of findings (methodological or conceptual) needs to be discussed. The study should also indicate the mechanism employed to address the methodological flaws of previous studies that led to an inconclusive result. 2. The unique gap that the study considered (an issue never addressed before) and the contribution it has towards the advancement of knowledge needs to be clearly stated. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract can further be modified as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should start by briefly discussing the importance of the issue and the gap identified. • It should also provide the policy and managerial implication of the finding of the study. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript contains all the major components of an article.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It follows relevant procedure to develop the hypothesis through relevant theory and empirical evidences. However, there are limitation regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The model adopted for estimation. • Result obtained for control variables is not discussed • No comparison is made with previous studies which confirm or contradict with the result reported. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It is not clear as to which referencing style is adopted in the study. The entire reference needs to be revised based on the referencing style followed by the journal.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The sentence in page 2 paragraph 4 line 1 seems incomplete• The sentence in page 3 paragraph 1 line 1-3 is difficult to comprehend.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I think there is more room for improvement if for example the study considers appropriate analysis tools recommend for panel data: Fixed effect or Random effect regression.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Asegid Getachew Woldeamanuel
Department, University & Country	Hawassa University, Ethiopia