

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(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 research is important to the scientific community because the researcher made significant methodological contributions to the existing state of knowledge in the area of research by adopting a hybrid methodology to test for the statistical significance of determinants of FDI. The research stands out on account of its excellent methodological approach and the clarity of the data presentation and analysis sections as well as the discussion of the findings. The research work is highly commendable given that it is research gap is unique and the author does an excellent job in making contributions to the existing state of knowledge.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. My suggestion is: Determinants of Foreign Direct Investment Inflow into Uganda: 1987-2018	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive. However, there are grammatical errors that need to be rectified. I have corrected all the errors observed and this is evident in the attached revised manuscript. For example, "granger causality test" is corrected as the Granger Causality Test to indicate its standard usage in academia. Furthermore, It is observed that the keywords are written in sentence form. This is fundamentally wrong. Keywords are usually phrases or words usually a minimum of five. Therefore, I suggest that the following be included as the keywords: Determinants, Foreign Direct Investment, Economic Growth, Granger Causality Test and Vector Error Correction Model.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes! However, there is no need to ascribe a number to the References. It is not a standard practice.	
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.	The paper is scientifically correct due to its robust and appropriate methodology as shown in the methodology and data analysis sections. The methodology adopted is suitable to address the objectives of the study because GCT and VECM deployed have been used extensively in empirical results on FDI with robust and significant outcomes. The analysis and discussion of the results of the data analysis is technically sound and clearly presented for the technical and non-technical audience to understand. The conclusion and recommendations are drawn directly from this finding of the research, making the paper to have substantial policy relevance and application.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are not sufficient because most of the in-text citations are not referenced at the end of the paper. There is a lot of improvement required in the referencing section and I think in addition to adding adequate references, the references should be presented in APA 6 Referencing Style. The current referencing style is not consistent with any edition of APA Style.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. However, there are grammatical and typographical errors that need to be corrected to make the paper perfect for academic writing. I have taken time to correct some of the errors, but further editorial and proofreading work can be done to improve on the quality of pedagogy.	
Optional/General comments	There is a fundamental omission from the paper and that omission is the absence of a section on literature review. Traditionally, the literature review section is the heart of any research work and leaving it out leaves the paper with no theoretical substance. The literature review should be subdivided into three sections, namely: Conceptual review, Theoretical Review and Empirical Review . All three sections will intertwine to put the paper on a solid theoretical grounding to meet the minimum requirement of an academic paper. The literature review section is recommended to be included in the section immediately after the introduction and it is to be numbered as 2.0 Literature Review. 2.1 Conceptual Review. 2.2 Theoretical Review. 2.3 Empirical Review .	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Majekodunmi Waheed Oladipo
Department, University & Country	Lagos State University, Nigeria