

### Important Notes:

1. The below Editor Message files are merely representative samples. The nature, number, and content of remarks/notes in these files will depend on your manuscript's requirements.
2. We use Remarks as a means of communicating with the author and clarify certain parts, sentences, or information in the text. This may include clarifications (1) on whether the edited sentence conveys the intended meaning, (2) after editing any ambiguous sentence with respect to language and context, (3) after making any stylistic changes introduced in the document, or (4) when there are options and suggestions involved.
3. The author can then choose to either make the change if deemed correct. We strongly suggest that all remarks provided with the main file be resolved before finalization, as this is important for successful publication.

### Meaning, Content, Language, or Style

**[Remark 1]** - To adequately state your proposition, we suggest revising to “We draw from Japanese firm-level data to estimate whether and to what extent Tobin’s  $q$  and total factor productivity (TFP) influence a firm’s choice of globalization mode.” Please check whether the intended meaning is conveyed.

**[Remark 2]** - Please check whether you mean “We make use of quantile regression to incorporate a strongly and negatively skewed sample distribution into our model.”

**[Remark 3]** - If the Melitz research covers only manufacturers, please consider specifically indicating manufacturers instead of firms.

**[Remark 4]** - Although your use of words instead of numerals is rhetorically correct, you are speaking about the actual values of dummy variables. Therefore, perhaps you should use the numerals 0 and 1, just as you would use numerals for the value of any other variable.

**[Remark 5]** - Please note that this statement of your research question does not parallel your abstract and conclusion. Here you say you focus specifically on firms that have already adopted more than one globalization mode. However, in the abstract and conclusion, you speak only of how the firm choice of

---

globalization mode differs. That is, there you do not indicate that your research covers firms that already do both FDI and outsourcing. However, there is a further confusion about this point later in the manuscript. Please see Remarks 10 and 11 below.

**[Remark 6]** - We suggest revising this sentence. Please clarify that you are not are not actually talking about the firm's choice of globalization mode because the firms have already chosen to do both FDI and outsourcing. Rather, what you seem to be talking about is a continuing preference for a mode of investment once the firm has reached a specific threshold of Tobin or TFP.

**[Remark 7]** - There is potential confusion about whether your analysis includes firms that engage in only one mode of international engagement. Here you specifically say that your sample includes firms that engage in at least one globalization activity. But as noted in Remark 7, your stated research question involves firms that engage in multiple globalization modes. Please clarify.

**[Remark 8]** - Here again, it seems as if you are interested only in firms with multiple modes, as you exclude observations from firms that have a 0 value for some measure of FDI. Please clarify.

**[Remark 9]** - A solid line, of course, would look like \_\_\_\_\_. A dashed line or a broken line might look like -----. It is unclear what a short-dashed line might be. Do you mean a dotted line, as in .....?

**[Remark 10]** -Do you mean “lagging in one period” or “lagged by one period”? Please clarify.