



Paper: **“Exchange-Traded Funds: What You Need to Know?”**

Corresponding Author: Remy Nyukorong

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n19p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Okoli, Moses Ikechukwu
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

Published: 31.07.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Okoli, Moses Ikechukwu	Email:
University/Country: Department of Cooperative Economics and Management, Faculty of Management sciences, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.	
Date Manuscript Received: 2nd July, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 7th July, 2020
Manuscript Title: Exchange-Traded Funds: What You Need To Know	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0724/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>The object of the article is well presented which is to help asset owners and investors understand and use Exchange-Traded Funds to build institutional-quality portfolios. The method is also well spelt out which was through literature search in books, journal articles and the internet <u>but the results of the study are not stated in the abstract.</u></i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The manuscript is grammatically satisfactory</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>There is no section that treats the methodology used for the study.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>There is a number of spacing errors in the manuscripts</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions are robust but there is need to itemize them to look more explicit, so that recommendations can be made on the basis of that.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<p>i. <i>Some of your in-text citations are not appropriate. For example: Hill et al., 2015, Itzhak et al, 2017, Anson et al., 2011, Prather et al., 2009, Madhavan et al., 2014, & Ahn et al., 2020. These authors should be cited in full in their first citation before the use of et al in subsequent citations.</i></p> <p>ii. <i>A number of works you cited are not included in your references:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Hill et al., 2015 b. Stevenson & Tuckwell, 2019 c. Ferri, 2007 d. Ferri, 2007 e. Blitz, Huij and Swinkels (2011) f. Mazumder, 2014 g. Tuckwell (2019) <p>iii. <i>Segal, (2029) is wrongly written. 2029 is still 9years away from now. See page 16 of the manuscript</i></p>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	

Reject	
--------	--

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Kindly look at the comments and address them. You can also give it to a colleagues of yours for proper editing.