

Review Form2

Book Name:	Business, Management and Economics: Research Progress
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2455
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINANTS OF UGANDA'S FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT INFLOWS IN THE PERIOD BETWEEN 1987 AND 2018
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article is insightfullfo the government and poicy makers of Uganda. That is, it helps to identify in which variables the policy makers and government should focus on so as to attract more foreign direct investment from abroad. So the manuscript is important in contributing for the government and the community of Uganda.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is not suitable. It is better to use the title as 'Determinants of foreign direct investment in Uganda'. Mentioning the time is not needed on the title. It should be presented in scope or methodology part.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes the abstract is comprehensive. But the key words part should be written again. Key word can not be a title it self. It should be three, four or five key words or phrases.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes it is appropriate. But, the tabular and graphical presentations should be on the result and discussion part. On the introduction part, you can write the statistical trends in paragraph forms by citing appropriate sources.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Despite of some minor corrections to be made, the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. It gives insightfull implications to the government and policy makers about the main detrminants to promote FDI in Uganda.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-	The references are very small in number. Most of them are old and recent literatures and recent studies are not used. Each explanations in your result should be evidenced by literatures. This may be why your refernces are limited in number.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is good. But, some sentences need revision to make the English more understandable. I suggest the researcher to give the manuscript for the english language expert for more refining.	
Optional/General comments	- It is better specify the model by using theoretical and more empirical literatures. More evidences are needed for the model specification part. The researcher only used one literature [(Taremwa, 2015)] which is not enough. - The Uganda's economy was liberalized in 1992. So, itneeds the dummy variable before 1992 and after 1992. Because according to literatures, liberalizing the economy can directly affect the inflow of FDI. - The way of presenting the result of vector error correction table is not good. You can make it more attractive by presenting the result using another table which shows the variables, coefficients, standard error, t-value and p-value clearly for the readers. - The estimation result is not well discussed. Presenting sign relationships and percentages is not enough in explaing the result. Each variables result should be evidenced by theories and previous empirical studies. It will be more attractive to compare your result with other related studies as 'consistent' and 'inconsistent'. I did not see any theoretical explanations and any previous related studies in your discussion of results part. - The recommendation part should be revised. I am not convinced with it.	

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:	Garedew Aweke Gizaw
Department, University & Country	Dilla University, Ethiopia