

## REVIEW REPORT

<b>Title Manuscript</b>	C.E.O FINANCIAL LITERACY AND CORPORATE FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE IN INDONESIA: MEDIATING ROLE OF SOURCES OF INVESTMENT DECISIONS		
<b>Date Submission</b>	November 17, 2019	<b>Period of Review</b>	15 January 2019 – 12 March 2019

Evaluation Criteria	Score	
	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2
<i>Journal Relevance Rating:</i> 10/09 = Highly relevant 08/07 = Mostly 06/05 = Some 04/03 = Marginal 02/01 = Not relevant	9	8
Originality/Novelty Rating 10/09 = Trailblazing, Significant contribution 08/07 = Pioneering work, important contribution 06/05 = One step ahead of similar work, minor contribution 04/03 = Yet another paper about this idea, questionable contribution 02/01 = It has been said many time before, no contribution	7.5	7.5
Paper Objective(s) and Justification Rating : 10/09 = Objectives very clear, excellent justification 08/07 = Objectives are clear, good justification 06/05 = More clarification needed 04/03 = Unclear or too many objectives 02/01 = Unacceptable	8	7

Evaluation Criteria	Score	
	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2
<p>Theoretical Foundations/ Literature Review Rating :</p> <p>10/09 = Excellent analysis &amp; critique of relevant theory/literature and seminal works</p> <p>08/07 = Good analysis/critique, a couple of missing works to add and/or minor improvements</p> <p>06/05 = A number of important works missing and/or further literature analysis/critique is needed</p> <p>04/03 = Minimal analysis/critique, key seminal literature/theory omitted</p> <p>02/01 = Unacceptable</p>	7.5	7.5
<p>Research Methodology/Approach Rating :</p> <p>10/09 = Excellent, among best I have seen, appropriate approach used, limitation acknowledged</p> <p>08/07 = Good justification/description, appropriate approach used limitation acknowledge</p> <p>06/05 = Okay, but needs elaboration/more justification/improved acknowledgement of limitations</p> <p>04/03 = Minimal justification/description, more limitation acknowledgement, concern about approach</p> <p>02/01 = Unacceptable, NA = Not Applicable (conceptual paper)</p>	7	7
<p>Findings/Discussion Rating:</p> <p>10/09 = Excellent discussion, compares findings with existing knowledge, among best I have seen</p> <p>08/07 = Good discussion, consistent with limitations of research approach, minor improvements</p> <p>06/05 = Okay, but some concerns about discussion inconsistencies with findings and/or limitations</p> <p>04/03 = Little comparison with existing knowledge, some major concerns about discussion</p> <p>02/01 = Unacceptable, NA = Not Applicable (conceptual paper)</p>	7.5	7.5
<p>Theoretical Implications Rating:</p> <p>10/09 = Significant implications</p> <p>08/07 = Sound implications</p> <p>06/05 = Apparent, needs elaboration</p> <p>04/03 = Implication unclear, covered minimally</p> <p>02/01 = No implications apparent or discussed</p>	7	7

Evaluation Criteria	Score	
	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2
Practical Implications Rating 10/09 = Significant implications 08/07 = Sound implications 06/05 = Apparent, needs elaboration 04/03 = Implication unclear, covered minimally 02/01 = No implications apparent or discussed	7	7
Conclusions/Future Research Rating 10/09 = Conclusion consistent with empirical findings & raises essential, new future research paths 08/07 = Good defensible conclusions & raises useful, important, fairly new future research directions 06/05 = Some inconsistencies with empirical findings and/or future research needs elaboration 04/03 = Conclusions and future research needs considerable work 02/01 = Unacceptable	7	7
Paper Structure Rating: 10/09 = Excellent structure, logical argument flow 08/07 = Good structure, logical argument flow 06/05 = Structure/flows needs work 04/03 = Needs considerable work 02/01 = Unacceptable	8	8
Writing Clarity Rating: 10/09 = Excellent, no typos/grammars error 08/07 = Well written, minor typos/grammars error 06/05 = Readable but requires some work 04/03 = Needs considerable work 02/01 = Unacceptable	8	8

Recommendation from Reviewers:

Recommendation	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2
Accept without content changes		
Accept with minor content changes	X	X
Accept with major content changes		
Reject – unsuitable for publications		

Recommendation to authors (for revision):

Please make necessary improvement accordingly :

1. Theoretical framework need more justifications from relevant literatures.
2. Research finding and discussion should compare with relevant previous studies.
3. Please describe your research limitation and implication. It is important for give suggestion to future studies.

This research paper provides empirical evidence that enriches theories and I suggest to authors improve the manuscript quality in order to contribute a beneficial impact on the body of knowledge, especially under financial literacy and financial performance issues.

Sincerely,



Managing Editor  
**Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues**  
**ISSN 2029-7025 (Online) - ISSN 2029-7017 (Print)**