

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_119064
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on the Correlation between R&D Investment and Financial Performance-Taking the Automobile Manufacturing Industry as an Example
Type of the Article	

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript titled "A Study on the Correlation between Research and Development Investment and Financial Performance in the Automobile Manufacturing Industry" presents significant findings that are highly relevant to the scientific community. It offers novel insights into the relationship between R&D investments and financial outcomes, advancing our understanding of strategic financial management within the automobile sector. The rigorous methodology and comprehensive analysis ensure the reliability and applicability of the results. This work will likely stimulate further studies and discussions, making it a valuable contribution to the existing body of knowledge.</p> <p>2. The original title is generally clear but could be made more concise and formal. Here's an alternative suggestion: "The Impact of Research and Development Investment on Financial Performance in the Automobile Manufacturing Industry" This title succinctly captures the focus of the study while maintaining a formal tone.</p> <p>3. This revision aims to make the abstract more structured, specific, and easy to understand, which should address the reviewer's concerns. The abstract of the author's article provides a good overview of the research topic, methodology, and findings. However, it can be improved for clarity and coherence. Here are a few suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Opening Statement: The first sentence is quite general and could be more directly related to author's specific research focus. Flow and Structure: Ensure the abstract flows logically from the importance of the topic, and objectives to the methodology, findings, theoretical and practical implications and sometimes recommendations and future directions and actions too. Specificity: Be more specific about what aspects of financial performance you are studying. Conciseness: Some sentences can be more concise to make the abstract easier to read. <p>4. Overall Structure and Subsections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Title <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: Clear and reflective of the study's focus. • Recommendation: Consider shortening for conciseness, e.g., "Correlation between R&D Investment and Financial Performance in Automobile Manufacturing." <input type="checkbox"/> Abstract <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: Provides a good overview but is lengthy. • Recommendation: Summarize key findings and recommendations more concisely. <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: Sets context well, emphasizing R&D's importance in the automobile industry. • Recommendation: Integrate discussions on China's policies and industry growth more seamlessly. <input type="checkbox"/> Literature Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: Comprehensive but somewhat repetitive. • Recommendation: Streamline to avoid repetition and focus on key studies relevant to 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>hypotheses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Hypotheses<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comment: Clearly stated and logically derived.• Recommendation: Ensure hypotheses are distinct and directly testable.<input type="checkbox"/> Methodology<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comment: Detailed, covering sample selection, data sources, variables, and model construction.• Recommendation: Clarify rationale behind choosing control variables; ensure statistical methods are clearly described.<input type="checkbox"/> Results<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comment: Presented clearly with appropriate use of tables.• Recommendation: Deepen interpretation of statistical significance and practical implications.<input type="checkbox"/> Robustness Test<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comment: Good addition for validating results.• Recommendation: Provide more detail on how robustness tests confirm findings.<input type="checkbox"/> Conclusion and Recommendation<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comment: Effectively summarizes findings but can be more concise.• Recommendation: Focus on significant insights and practical recommendations; highlight contributions to literature and implications for stakeholders. <p>5. The scientific accuracy assessment and recommendations</p> <p>General Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The manuscript appears scientifically correct with a relevant research question, sound methodology, and appropriate statistical analysis. Further scrutiny in certain areas is recommended for enhanced rigor. <p>Detailed Assessment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Research Question and Hypotheses<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Strength: Clearly defined research question; logically derived hypotheses.○ Issue: Ensure hypotheses are specific and directly testable.2. Literature Review<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Strength: Comprehensive and strong foundation.○ Issue: Verify all cited studies are current and relevant.3. Methodology<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Strength: Well-detailed with clear explanations.○ Issue: Justify control variables with literature references; state and support any assumptions.4. Data Analysis	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Strength: Appropriate statistical methods; clear presentation.○ Issue: Address potential issues like multicollinearity, heteroscedasticity, or autocorrelation. <p>5. Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Strength: Clear presentation with tables and figures.○ Issue: Ensure unbiased interpretation; consider all potential explanations and acknowledge limitations. <p>6. Robustness Tests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Strength: Adds credibility.○ Issue: Sufficiently describe tests and interpret results in the context of main findings. <p>7. Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Strength: Effective summary of key findings.○ Issue: Accurately reflect data; acknowledge limitations and potential biases. <p>Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Verification of Statistical Methods<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Double-check methods and calculations; consider a statistician's review.2. Assumptions and Limitations<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Clearly state assumptions and discuss study limitations for transparency.3. Peer Review<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Submit to a peer-reviewed journal for expert validation and additional insights <p>6. The references provided in the manuscript appear to be sufficient</p> <p>For the most part, it covering a range of relevant literature in the field. However, there are a few areas where additional recent references could strengthen the manuscript:</p> <p>. The manuscript's references are generally sufficient, covering relevant literature. However, to strengthen it further, consider adding recent references, particularly from the last 2-3 years, in specific relevant topics or methodologies. Including comparison studies, regional or sector-specific studies, and perspectives that offer different methodologies would also enhance the manuscript. Here are some suggestions for additional references to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• [Author(s), Year, Title, Journal/Book]• [Author(s), Year, Title, Journal/Book]• [Author(s), Year, Title, Journal/Book] <p>Incorporating these would provide a more comprehensive overview of the current state of research. I recommend reviewing these suggestions and adding relevant references as appropriate.</p>	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.7

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The language and English quality of the article are generally good and suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are areas where improvements can be made for clarity and academic rigor:</p> <p>The article is generally well-written and suitable for scholarly communication, but several improvements can enhance its clarity and academic rigor:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sentence Structure and Clarity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Break long sentences into shorter, clearer ones. ○ Ensure each sentence conveys a single clear idea to avoid ambiguity. 2. Academic Tone: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maintain a formal and academic tone throughout. ○ Eliminate any colloquial or informal language. 3. Precision in Expression: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Define and use terms and concepts consistently and precisely. ○ Avoid vague statements; support assertions with specific data or evidence. 4. Grammar and Punctuation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Check for grammatical errors, particularly subject-verb agreement and tense consistency. ○ Use punctuation marks correctly, especially commas and semicolons. 5. Clarity of Arguments and Evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strengthen the logical flow of arguments by clearly linking evidence to conclusions. ○ Provide sufficient context and background information to support claims and interpretations. <p>Overall, while the article is well-suited for scholarly communication, these minor revisions will enhance its clarity, precision, and academic rigor.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Here's a summary of the optional/general comments for the author's consideration to refine their article for scholarly publication:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Structural Organization: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ensure the introduction states the study's purpose and objectives. ○ Detail the methodology transparently. ○ Present results logically. ○ Interpret findings in the discussion section in relation to existing literature. ○ Summarize key findings and implications in the conclusion. 2. Literature Review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Make the review comprehensive and up-to-date with recent and seminal works. ○ Analyze and synthesize the literature to highlight the gaps addressed by the study. 3. Methodological Rigor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clearly describe research methodology, including sampling, data collection, and analysis. ○ Justify methodological choices and discuss limitations or biases. 4. Original Contribution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clearly articulate the study's original contribution to the field. ○ Highlight how findings advance understanding or practice. 5. Citations and References: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Support all claims with appropriate citations from reputable sources. ○ Ensure accuracy and proper formatting of references. 6. Visual Aids: 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Use tables, figures, or graphs to enhance data or concept presentation.○ Ensure visuals are clearly labeled and referenced in the text. <p>7. Clarity of Title and Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Ensure the title accurately reflects the article's content.○ Make the abstract succinctly summarize the study's purpose, methods, key findings, and implications. <p>8. Reviewer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Address specific feedback from reviewers.○ Implement suggested revisions carefully. <p>These comments aim to help refine the article to enhance its quality and impact for scholarly publication.</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Tahir
Department, University & Country	Iqra National University, Pakistan