

Decision Letter (JMD-07-2018-0211.R1)

Subject: Journal of Management Development - Decision on Manuscript ID JMD-07-2018-0211.R1

Body: 24-Oct-2018

Dear Mr. Wahjudi,

It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript entitled "Factors Affecting Dividend Policy in Manufacturing Companies in Indonesia Stock Exchange" in its current form for publication in the Journal of Management Development. The comments of the reviewer(s) who reviewed your manuscript are included at the foot of this letter.

If you would like more information about Emerald's copyright policy please visit the Information & Forms section in the Resources section of your Author Centre.

If you have an ORCID please check your account details to ensure that your ORCID is validated.

FOR OPEN ACCESS AUTHORS: Please note if you have indicated that you would like to publish your article as Open Access via Emerald's Gold Open Access route, you are required to complete a Creative Commons Attribution Licence - CCBY 4.0 (in place of the standard copyright assignment form referenced above). You will receive a follow up email within the next 30 days with a link to the CCBY licence and information regarding payment of the Article Processing Charge. If you have indicated that you might be eligible for a prepaid APC voucher, you will also be informed at this point if a voucher is available to you (for more information on APC vouchers please see <http://www.emeraldpublishing.com/oapartnerships>)

Thank you for your fine contribution. We look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Yours sincerely,
Prof. Rosa Caiazza
Editor, Journal of Management Development
rosa.caiazza@uniparthenope.it

Associate Editor and Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Accept

Comments:
Ready for publication

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes, the modified manuscript is clearly the originality and novelty, now the paper show the gap for each previous study.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Yes, it is

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper

is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: The method is appropriate and well designed, the revised paper is complete the description of dataset.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The paper shown the descriptive statistics clearly, and all the result is appropriate to analyze, and clearly result

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Very good

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Very good

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Accept

Comments:

-

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes, the introduction is short but quite clear. The paper has new and significant information adequate to justify the publication.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Yes, literature review is adequate and relevant in field. The result for each previous study was clearly explained.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Yes, it's appropriate. Overall is ok.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Yes, you explain it well. You give the assumptions result and the result of the model with a good way.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Yes, Both of theoretical and practical implications of the research was developed well.

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Yes. The paper is easy to understand

Date Sent: 24-Oct-2018

