

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_87389
Title of the Manuscript:	A study on the influence of Foreign Direct Investment on the ability of Independent Innovation in Eastern 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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The paper needs a significant effort in terms of the quality of the redaction and methodological aspects (references not in accordance with APA). There are several excerpts that simply do not make sense, since the very beginning (abstract), for instance: "In order to deeply study the impact of foreign direct investment on independent innovation in eastern China, to explore ways to improve the ability of independent innovation in eastern China."; "And draw relevant conclusions: foreign direct investment, R&D personnel input, the degree of trade openness and the level of economic development all play a significant role in promoting the eastern independent innovation capability; however, R&D capital investment has a restraining effect on innovation ability to a certain extent."; "In the correlation test, the correlation coefficient is positive when the correlation coefficient is positive, and negative when the correlation coefficient is negative" (is not that obvious?); "Based on the explanatory variables, explanatory variables and control variables selected above..."(??); Those are just a few examples of a major revision that is necessary to make this paper readable and understandable. Below there is an example of the references provided by authors in the wrong format: 1. Cheng Liwei, Sun Wei, Wang Jiuyun. Motivation, characteristics of foreign investment and the efficiency of independent innovation in high-tech industries in China[J]. China Soft Science, 2010(7): 45-57,164.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fábio Henrique Ferreira de Albuquerque
Department, University & Country	Instituto Politécnico de Lisboa, Portugal