

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

Harish Singla

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In abstract author is saying in the opening statement that "The present research is undertaken to understand the investor's behaviour and acceptability of initial public offer from the industrial houses". Then in the closing statement authors are saying "The present study aimed at understanding the perceptions of the prospecting investors in IPO of Cuttack city is undertaken". These are two different statements and seems quite confusing.

"In case of IPO, the past performance of such equity shares is not known and future of such shares depends upon the success of the project". How success of IPO is dependant on success of project? How do you define performance of an IPO? Are you taking of short-term performance or long-term performance? There is absolutely no clarity in the opening paragraph.

"The present study is undertaken to study the investor's perception towards IPO in the city of Cuttack, Odisha". Why? What is the knowledge gap that authors want to address through this study?

"Over the period economic condition of the people changed to a great extent, but western India is far away in comparison to eastern India". Is there any data to support this claim? If yes, present that data. Further, how does economic condition of people relate to performance of IPOs.

The literature of IPO performance is vast and there are more than 1000 scholarly papers available in the domain. However, authors have cited only 10 papers, that too include one RBI report and few magazine articles. In short, the paper does not have any literature review. A proper literature review should tell us what kind of perception investors usually have in countries like China, Canada, USA, Europe and India. What is their investment in IPO habits. How do they select IPOs and what are the barriers? Based on the literature review, authors would be in a position to develop of questionnaire and collect data. Without doing a proper literature review, how to the authors know which questions to be asked?

There is no section on research methodology. How will one know what kind of questions are asked, what was the data source, Sampling procedure, period of data collection etc. How many respondents were approached and what is the response rate? How did author make sure that there is no response bias?

The data analysis is too elementary to conclude anything. What is the purpose of Table 5. In fact, there are too many graphs and tables just to explain the demographic profile of respondents.

“The potential investors asked about the knowledge to invest in Initial Public Offer, out of the 96 respondents only 18 people are investing in IPOs”. If someone is not investing in IPO, that does not mean that there is lack of knowledge or awareness. So, to say that there is lack of awareness because people are not investing in IPOs is absolutely wrong.

Again in 4.2, it seems wrong questions have been asked. Among, factors responsible for non-investment authors give the option of delay in return, risk factor and period for return as options. If you read the world literature on IPOs, the empirical data proves that IPOs in India are most rewarding and the fastest ways of earning.

Section 4.3. In your profile of respondents, we can see that only 21 people have income above 5 lakhs. It is quite likely that only those people with higher income will go for investment in Equity.

Author has performed a regression analysis, but nowhere informed what is dependent variable and what is independent variable?

In Table 18, IPOs are categorized as successful or fail. On what basis.

The data source “Source: <https://www.chittorgarh.com/report/list-of-ipo-by-year-fund-raised-success-mainboard/85/>” is not authentic and reliable. It's just a website promoted by few brokers and gives information about IPOs and blogs.

There is no discussion section which draws how the findings of their study are similar to or contradicts the other studies.

The paper is written very poorly with a significant number of grammatical and sentence formation mistakes.

The overall impression of the paper is very poor.