

Review of: "Investment Through IPO in Cuttack City of Odisha: Trends & Perception Analysis"

Dr. Rajat Deb

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Reviewer's Report

Comment to the Editor:

The paper has not been written as an academic piece of work rather in a very casual manner with number of grammatical mistakes. It has not identified the research gap and has little contribution in the literature. The, Introduction section could not substantiate the epistemological basis of research, Literature Review has been written in a lop-sided manner, the methodology has been average, and findings have not been properly discussed. The conclusion section should exhibit overall conclusion, limitation of the study, practical implications of the findings and a roadmap for future research, which has not been presented. Accordingly, in its present form the paper must be rejected.

Comment to the Authors:

Introduction Section

One of the biggest issues with this paper is the lack of cohesiveness and a structure in introducing the research problem. The following points should be considered:

- (a) This section *must be re-written* and enlarged with an emphasis on the epistemological basis of the research.
- (b) The identification of the problem should be merged in this section highlighting the gaps, if any in the literature and how your research is a new vista that could contribute in the body of knowledge (existing literature).
- (c) The **objective(s) of the study** should be incorporated categorically and point wise.
- (d) The last paragraph of this section should indicate to the readers a glimpse about the subsequent sections of the paper.

2. Literature Review

- This section should be written in any of the following ways- Descriptive, Integrative, Thematic and chronologically.
- It should generally address the issues-

The opinion of the scholars about the research topic.

The ongoing debate about the topic.

The ideas of agreement or disagreement with logic.

What has not been talked in the literature?

The research gap and the paper's contribution in the literature have not been discussed.

Methodology

This Section should be written as the present study has not indicated about this.

(a) Research design should be clearly stated.

(b) Hypotheses should be framed identifying the variables.

(c) What is the rationality of the study period?

(d) What sampling procedures have been applied and how samples were chosen?

(e) what is the rationality of applying Descriptive Statistics and Inferential Statistics (Regression)?

(f) What procedures have followed to counter the *internal validity threats* (selection threat, diffusion treatment threat, regression threat, history threat, and compensatory rivalry threat) and *external validity threats*?

4. Results

The **findings must be re-written**. How the results have supported/deviated the literature? Results should be written following the scientific writing guidelines indicating how it has supported the existing literature and/or contradicted.

The paper just stops at analysis and therefore requires enriching the discussion in terms of the insights gained from the data analysis and how it is relevant in a broader context. Just enumerating the findings applying statistical techniques without any meaningful discussion of the results reduces the quality of the paper. So, **discussion should be enriched**. Discussion must be restricted based on results.

5. Conclusion

The conclusions should be a conclusion of the entire research process (and not just the research findings).

The section **must be re-written** answering the research questions, meeting the objectives and, if appropriate, supporting or otherwise the hypotheses.

A paragraph must be added acknowledging the **limitations** (highlighting the study period, sample framing, sample size, technique of sampling, methods of data collection, statistical techniques used) of the research.

A paragraph should clearly indicate the practical applications of the findings.

Finally, a paragraph should be added indicating future research directions.

6. Other Suggestions:

Referencing style is extremely poor. Check the referencing style followed by the journal and referencing must be in alphabetical order (if APA 6th/7th Edition is followed), numbering (if Vancouver style is followed including in-text citations) and like.

Please take care of English language and Grammar.

Use past/present perfect tense for Literature Review and present tense for Results, Discussion and Conclusions.