



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_49428
Title of the Manuscript:	Herding Behaviour in Investment Decision Making: A Review
Type of the 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	<p>Thanks for the authors' effort for reviewing 85 papers and conduct this study. However, the below are some problems I currently think of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It seems that there is no particular direction in this review. What I mean is that besides the "introduction" and "conclusion" parts, the other parts are just randomly selected for discussion. Why these sub-topics are particularly chosen and grouped together for discussion? Is it due to gap in literature or what are some other particular reasons these sub-topics are chosen for discussion (especially how they are grouped together)? This is very important because it shows a clearer flow in the paper. After reading the whole paper, I don't understand why the authors write this paper besides knowing that it is a review. 2. With the issue above, it also raises another question: What is the authors' motivation of conducting this paper? Just like playing with the toy "Lego", after assembling all parts, players can see the theme of the whole set of Lego pieces assembled. However, after reading your paper, I don't know the main theme of your paper. Is it an introduction to layman what herding is? OR you are trying to argue that current literature on herding is not comprehensive? 3. Who are the target audiences of your paper? 4. The conclusion should somehow have some connections to the introduction. 5. For this kind of literature review paper, the persuasive power will be higher if the authors can cite top-tier journals. I was planning to check whether the cited journals are top-tier journals, but the authors only display the short-forms of the journals. I was not able to check because I am not sure which journal the authors exactly cited. 6. The authors should show the % of the cited papers that are top-tier journals. 	We have reviewed the manuscript based on the comments
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors claim that they have reviewed 85 papers but only 79 papers are documented in the reference section. 2. Please check whether the citation method used in the reference section is consistent with those required by the journal. 3. I don't understand why in the reference section, the names of some journals cited are written in short forms. For example: citation #17: Int J Econ Fin. It is more appropriate to write the full version of the journal. 	<p>Correction made</p> <p>Corrected</p>
Optional/General comments		



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>	