



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_5427
Title of the Manuscript:	THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORKING CAPITAL MANAGEMENT AND PROFITABILITY: EVIDENCE FROM SAUDI CEMENT COMPANIES
Type of the Article	Research Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The LR section requires some improvements – in terms of write-up and there should be linkage among the studies – at times mention is made we – (e.g we examine the effect of different variables.....) which is not proper – we have used pooledshould be the studies or they found.....</p> <p>The study objectives appear too many and should be 2 to 3 and as it is, it gives the impression that there are 6 objectives – needs to be specific and concise</p> <p>I am not able to determine which regression techniques is being used – is it panel data methodology or OLS – the number of observation is 40 (8 firms for 5 years) and in itself it will limit the analysis.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>The introduction part should state clearly how this study demarks from the previous studies and how it contributes to the growing literature on WCM.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Define CAGR, GCC - Size 6% - not clear 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The author should improve the overall write up of the paper and correct some of the typo error – debt i/o dept</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - findings corresponds - table 3 – can delete the upper part - constant coefficient – high value - most of the results are insignificant – may be to incorrect model specification and few number of observations 	
---	--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dambeegan Padachi
Department, University & Country	Head of School of Accounting, Finance and Economics, University of Technology, Mauritius