



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_12762
Title of the Manuscript:	Corporate Fraud Tendencies Verses IPOs Initial Returns Volatility
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Hypothesis formulated for the study – whether the author reject it or failed to reject it, is not clearly mentioned in the report, even though the results are clearly explained	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Use of I /We etc. in the report need to be changed	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Methodology is sound Analysis is rigorous Overall presentation is good So the research paper can be accepted after incorporating minor corrections regarding grammer, usages etc. For eg. Usage - It is evident to also observe here that(Line No.393) it should be either - it is evident that, or it is also observed that	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer