



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_65078
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Capital Structure on Financial Performance of Selected Quoted Food and Beverages Manufacturing Industries in Nigeria
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>1- The general hypotheses was well defined, but there are a kind of overlapping propositions between the research questions and the objectives of the study. 1.1- I suggest to cut this double statements (research questions and objectives of the study) and make them clear in just one structure of correlated questions and objectives.</p> <p>2-The same suggestion I made for the statement of hypotheses and the entire structure of the study, including the conclusion and recommendation. The study needs to explore in a better way its findings and the correlated results. 2.1 I suggest to explain much better the results and findings in conclusion and recommendation.</p> <p>3- There are three statements of questions that get the reader confusing: -Research Questions -Objectives of the Study -Statement of Hypotheses 3.1- I suggest again to organize the text in a just one single structure of questions and correlated hypotheses and objectives.</p> <p>4- The literature review is relevant, but is related in its majority in a single region study and in Nigeria. 4.1-I suggest to investigate if there are other papers in the same research field that considers firms in countries of different levels of development. Try to explore and compare the statements. 4.2- Search for other relevant points of view in the literature.</p> <p>5- As a final recommendation, I suggest to explain in the text (and in the conclusion) the main connections between the statements and the empirical results. 5.1-As an example, see the following statement from page 1/abstract: "It is therefore, recommended that in order to minimize the negative impacts of huge debts employed on firm's value, debt with lower cost of borrowing should be embraced and priority should be placed by firms on increase in share prices than increase in accounting profits."</p> <p>6- The conclusion and recommendation structures are quite short and there is a lack of a more explicit argumentative connections between them.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1- The empirical/statistic structure was well organized, and I infer that it was built in a proper way. I have no comments for this matter.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>1- The study was well organized in its general objective.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Danielle Sandi Pinheiro
Department, University & Country	University of Brasilia, Brazil