



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_47704
Title of the Manuscript:	CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE OF HOTELS IN ZANZIBAR
Type of the Article	Original 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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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 1. Introduction 2. 2. Regression Results	1. Authors should provide trend of how CSR implementation is affecting the financial performance of hotels in Zanzibar and be a little bit specific. This kind of trend will help to provide useful recommendations after findings of the study. 2. Author to provide clarity on number of observations. Authors should clarify number of variables used for calculation of number of observations. In Table 2.3. There are four independent. But your calculation shows the use of five. Or how did you arrive at 140.	We have tried to revise the manuscript by incorporating the correction
Minor REVISION comments 1. Literature Review 2. Editorial 3. Conclusion	1. Literature review should be rearranged to reflect conceptual, theoretical and empirical reviews. The whole thing is lumped up. Also, authors should state clearly the hypotheses to be tested after the literature review. At least two hypotheses suing ROA and ROE each. 2. Authors should take time to address some editorial issues such as typing errors. An example is using CSP instead of CSR for corporate social responsibility. Check line 138 for this. Also line 139 2013-2017 instead of 2011-2017. 3. Authors should enhance the conclusion to show contribution to knowledge and suggestion for further studies.	Typing error corrected thoroughly Corrected Revised
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?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	