

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_86771
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis on the Influencing Factors of OFDI by Jiangsu Province in China
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 1.6**

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Methods: The paper has a sound research method, but still needs improving. the methods are adequate and associated with the comments made, the article has incorporated methodological and statistical details, making this work more accessible and understandable.</p> <p>Methods: Need improvement in the organization.</p> <p>Methods: Please explain how could use the current model correctly by providing real examples.</p> <p>The methods need to be specific and chosen according to real and correct hypotheses.</p> <p>Results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Results and discussion need to be restructured.</li> <li>2. Proposed measurements should be placed before hypotheses testing.</li> <li>3. They are interesting to study and review for comparative literature.</li> </ol> <p>Provide a detailed discussion of results, especially in terms of comparing the results with findings in the literature on the subject and discussing policy-related implications of the results.</p> <p>The manuscript should be edited thoroughly for language.</p> <p>The findings of the study have not been fully explained. After the problems in the method are resolved, the new findings to be obtained should be rewritten by comparing them with the findings in the literature.</p> <p>The authors should consider the following seriously:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abstract has a grammatical mistake.</li> <li>2. Abstract is not focused.</li> <li>3. Rationale for using dynamic population dynamics and investments. is not properly spelt out.</li> <li>4. At the end of the introduction the author should spell out the sections with numbers.</li> <li>5. Some intuitive graphs or scattered plots may be presented in the introductory section to motivate readers to justify the linkages between population dynamics and investments.</li> <li>6. Section numbering is not done and subsections are not mentioned with numbers. The organization is slightly scattered and needs more discipline.</li> <li>7. I can propose some orders as follows:</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction; 2. Literature Review; 2.1 Theoretical literature; 2.2 Empirical Literature; 3. Theory and Econometric Model; 4. Results and Interpretation; 5. Robustness of Results; 6. Conclusion and Policy Suggestion.</li> </ol> <p>Interpretation:</p> <p>It is important to compare results obtained with results of previous research in the same context (if any) or in other similar fields.</p> <p>Is there any practical implication of the study? as this is an exploratory study, it is appropriate.</p> <p>Interpretation should be more satisfying and persuasive.</p> <p>The interpretation is not sufficient as the authors need to test the effect of the proposed relationships and thus come out with meaningful conclusions. I believe that the paper in its current form has fewer contributions. As the previous comment has not yet been addressed, the interpretation needs revisions as well.</p> <p>Please make sure that all references are cited in the text.</p> <p>I think it is best for this initial model to have its methodological delimitation</p> <p>The manuscript should be organized well and arranged correctly according to the ethics of the journal and the standards of COPE.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>My specific comment follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Author needs to give a detailed analysis of all the methods.</li><li>2. Little more detailed analysis of policy implication</li></ol> <p>The author can provide a solid statistical theoretical basis that the item is not deleted. Because the purpose of your research is to build a model. If the instrument is not statistically valid, then your further built model is not fit. In my opinion, even though an instrument has a very established theoretical basis, in reality, the factor loading value did not prove, to meet the requirements, so it should be removed. Because it could be, it will be the difference between your research and other research, right?</p> <p>Authors should consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Language editing and proof reading is highly recommended for academic writing</li><li>2. if the research problem and hypotheses can be stated clearly, it will be easy to understand the findings to the reader</li><li>3. It is recommended to re-write the conclusion with more details while addressing the research problem and hypotheses while elaborating the implications. Further, it is suggested to add the significance of the study for the government, policy makers and other regulatory bodies, general public and other interested parties.</li></ol> <p>Additionally, I have here few observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) justification of study is missing.</li><li>2) literature review needs up-gradation. Some papers relating to the topic and subject of the study can be added.</li><li>3) update references.</li></ol> <p>The conclusion section still does not improve well according to the data analysis. Please develop it as should as be.</p> <p>However, the authors should consider some issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The authors did not use a multiple linear regression model.</li><li>• The authors have to understand from the mathematical point of view must introduce the graphical representations of the input data and the obtained results for all hypotheses.</li><li>• This study could provide the opportunity and space for authors and researchers from various other countries to conduct other studies in the same field based on this study and its results.</li><li>• The mathematical modelling must be introduced to introduce for all readers all aspects, which characterize a regression analysis.</li><li>• The results should compare with other approaches, other than linear regression.</li><li>• It appears that the paper is prepared in a rush.</li><li>• The author needs to do more thorough works on the literature.</li></ul> <p>Thus, all macroeconomic data are expected to be subjected to a unit root test first to determine their stationarity. If data are found out not to be stationary at all, then there is no need to regress them.</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The authors need to give a brief description of relevant theories.</li><li>• State the equation did not describe the method used.</li><li>• The empirical part of this paper may need to be strengthened.</li></ul> <p>Therefore, the authors must adhere to the technical and standard journal ethics, add the missing parts in the study and arrange them according to the principles of the journal's moral and guiding policy, according to the principles to be followed.</p> <p>There are missing parts in the study (Ethics and Editorial Policies), such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Authorship (Author Contributions)</li><li>• Raw Data</li><li>• Data Deposition</li><li>• Related Works</li><li>• Reporting Standards</li><li>• Declarations section</li><li>• Additional information</li><li>• Statistical resources</li></ul> <p>The authors should cite and consider these following papers to the current study:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Yuanyuan Gu, Bin Qiu. Studying in China and Foreign Direct Investment in China. An Empirical Study Based on National Data along the Belt and Road Initiative[J]. International Trade Issues,2017(04):83-94.</li><li>2. MUSGRAVE P. Direct investment abroad and the multinationals: effects on the United States economy [ M]. Washington. D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1975: 33-42.</li><li>3. Dunning J., "Multinational Enterprise and Global Economy", Journal of International Business Studies, Vol. 72, No.6, 1991, pp. 120 - 145.</li><li>4. En Chen, Fangfang Wang.An Empirical Analysis of the Factors Affecting China's Foreign Direct Investment—Based on the Investigation of International Panel Data from 2007 to 2009[J]. Commercial Economics and Management,2011(08):43-50.</li><li>5. Huifang Cheng, Xiang Yu. Analysis of Location Selection of China's Foreign Direct Investment by Gravitational Model[J]. World Economy,2004(11):23-30.</li><li>6. Daying Yan, Junjie Hong, Ren Bing. Determinants of Chinese Enterprises' Foreign Direct Investment: Empirical Analysis Based on System Perspective[J]. Nankai Management Review, 2009, 12(06): 135- 142+149.</li><li>7. Yanyan Ouyang. Analysis of the Factors Affecting the Reverse Technology Spillover of China's Foreign Direct Investment[J]. World Economy Study,2010(04):66-71+89.</li><li>8. Yaqing Yu.An Empirical Analysis of the Factors Affecting China's Foreign Direct Investment Behavior[J].World Economic Situation,2010(03):11-15.</li><li>9. Wen Chen. An Empirical Study of Determinants of China's Foreign Direct Investment—An Empirical Analysis Based on Dynamic Panel Data Model[J]. Science and Technology Information,2012(11):161-162.</li><li>10. Jing Bian, Wei Zhang. The Trade Effect of China's Foreign Direct Investment—Based on the Research of the "Belt and Road Initiative" [J]. Journal of Beijing Technology and Business University (Social Science Edition), 2019(05): 34-44.</li><li>11. Jialin Li,Yuanzhao Zhang .The Risks and Control Measures of Chinese</li></ol>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.6

	Enterprises' Foreign Investment under the New Situation[J].Asia- Pacific Economy,2019(04):88-94. <b>*All highlighted texts in the paper must be revised and improved by the authors.</b>	
--	---	--

**Review Form 1.6**

<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>Comments to authors: (Additional Evaluation)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The manuscript requires a professional language revision (proofreading).</li><li>2. The authors must follow the publishing rules and the editorial policies of this journal well, and adjust the manuscript according to the rules of this journal and in an orderly manner.</li><li>3. The manuscript is within the scope of the journal.</li><li>4. It is preferable to separate the study literature from the hypotheses and to make each of them in its part.</li><li>5. It is preferable to support and strengthen the introduction better than that, and the focus must be on clarification more.</li><li>6. It is better to link references at the beginning of the paragraphs rather than at the end.</li><li>7. The hypotheses of the study are laid down systematically and in a logical sequence, and they should be clear and readable for the readers.</li><li>8. In the methods section, we must focus on the most important terrorist incidents that took place in the period mentioned in the study.</li><li>9. The most important causes and factors that led to such incidents must be clarified and the possible means to properly control them.</li><li>10. In my opinion, the authors of this study can make better and more appropriate recommendations based on the findings of the study they reached.</li><li>11. The econometric model used in the study to achieve its objectives is a good and appropriate model for the study, through which more results can be settled if the authors set more research variables than the current ones.</li><li>12. In the Future Studies section, it is important to have an explanation of major and important reasons for conducting future studies on this topic for the current study.</li><li>13. Authors must support their recommendations in this part and direct them to other researchers to conduct this study in world-leading universities and institutes and to be at the center of their interests.</li><li>14. Researchers need to update the development of these theories.</li><li>15. The novelty of the study should be indicated in a special section at the end of the study after the conclusions section.</li><li>16. The theories of the study are still not clear and need more explanations.</li><li>17. The study was incorrect organized and needs to be organized well.</li><li>18. Language editing and proofreading are highly recommended for academic writing.</li><li>19. If the research problem and hypotheses can be stated clearly, it will be easy to understand the findings to the reader</li><li>20. It is recommended to re-write the conclusion with more details while addressing the research problem and hypotheses while elaborating the implications. Further, it is</li></ol>	
---------------------------------------	--	--

**Review Form 1.6**

	suggested to add the significance of the study for the government, policymakers and other regulatory bodies, general public and other interested parties. 21. The justification of the study is missing, and the references must be updated. 22. Literature review needs up-gradation. Some papers relating to the Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting can be added.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nemer Badwan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute, State of Palestine</b>