

**Review Form 1.7**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <b>South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</b>                                     |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_SAJSSSE_111112</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>INVESTMENT DECISIONS: ARE FINANCIAL KNOWLEDGE, RISK TOLERANCE AND EXPERIENCE IMPORTANT?</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Original Research Article</b>   |

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p><b>Only moderately so.</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Requires revision<br/>It is hard to render a judgment on it</p> <p>Yes, but seems like to much self-citing</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | <p>Not suitable.<br/>Major revision and editing is required.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>The paper requires a major revision. This is because the outcome of investment decisions should be capable of being compared interpersonally based on objective outcomes, whereas the investment decisions are evaluated by respondents themselves in the survey. It is not very clear how well the chosen analysis technique of SEM sits with this matter and some substantive comment is called on it. Of concern also is that the chosen criteria FK1-FK5 are not interpersonally comparable and there are seemingly few safeguards in place in the research to see if the actual knowledge of the respondents will be consistent with their statements. It can only be assumed that the questionnaires were equipped with this safeguard and further comment is also required on why such specific independent criteria have been chosen, and not others. The criteria, the way they are worded themselves, are very vague, as it is not clear, for example, if they relate to the knowledge of assets into which the respondent invests, or some more general stock of investment knowledge. A first-hand analysis of questionnaire design would be required to ascertain the matter, so the actual questionnaire structure should be discussed in the major revision with the sample questionnaire attached.</p> <p>Many of the findings in the Discussion and Conclusions sections are either too banal, or mundane; usually, research papers require greater nuances in making such.</p> |  |

**PART 2:**

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> |  |

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Andrey Artemenkov</b>                         |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Ariel University, TEAM University, Israel</b> |