

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_111546
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Government Subsidies and R&D Investment on the Operating Performance of New Energy Enterprises in China
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (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>1. Yes, the manuscript is important and relevant for scientific community, especially the R&amp;D part as it is an on-going process and vital for sustainability.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract needs to add few details on the methodology of empirical analysis.</p> <p>4. The structure is good but there must be spacing between the subsections.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references can be considered as recent but it suggested to add more relevant literatures in Section 2, especially in Section 2.3. In addition, the list of references is not as per APA style but can be maintained if it is according to the journal guidelines.</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>1. Yes, the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications but there are few grammatical mistakes that need to be corrected/reviewed. Please check.</p> <p>2. There are also few unsuitable phrases such as "it can be obtained"...To replace with "it is noteworthy". To check and edit accordingly.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. It is suggested to use Dependent variable instead of implicit variable.</p> <p>2. To explain more on the intermodal term i.e. the formula to derive the figures.</p> <p>3. To add detailed recommendations for future similar researches and analyses.</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><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>Hasroleffendy Hassan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia</b>