



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_48729
Title of the Manuscript:	DIVIDEND POLICY AND FINANCIAL PEROFRMANCE- A STUDY OF QUOTED MANUFACTURING FIRMS IN NIGERIA AND KENYA
Type of the Article	Review 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>Abstract – Needs to be redefined to incorporate the relevant issues in the study. Check the sentence construction Line 8 – 9. Also, the purpose of the study and sample technique used should be clearly stated.</p> <p>Introduction line 49 check spelling, line 96 and 146 reference should be checked. Literature gap of the article was not clearly justified by references and needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Conceptual and theoretical review has a few current pieces of literature, and it is recommended for current literature citations — references in adequate.</p> <p>Empirical review should give a critical review of the various constructs in relation to the situations in Kenya and Nigeria.</p> <p>Methodology Convenience sampling method used should be justified by the use of a reference</p> <p>Discussion – Good</p> <p>Theoretical and Practical Implications needs to be included after conclusion of the study.</p> <p>Conclusion – should include the possibility for future research based on the research gap of the study.</p> <p>Note: In all proofreading and proper referencing should be considered</p>	<p>The entire Abstract has been redefined as observed and the relevant issues incorporated, as well as the purpose and sample technique</p> <p>In line 9, a better construction was done beyond the spelling, line 96 reference was corrected and 146 corrected.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	Recommended	
Optional/General comments	<p>The study is good, and it provides adequate information to be considered for publication.</p> <p>Accept for publication if the necessary suggestions are completed</p>	

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>	No reviewer's comment