

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_103429
Title of the Manuscript:	Reactions of Stock Prices to Changes in Exchange Rate and Monetary Policy Rate of Central Banking System: Symmetry or Asymmetry
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajebea.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes. I commend the authors for the interesting and relevant study. The methodology is clear, and the results are interesting. The English language is not very clear. Although the manuscript has been written well, I have a few comments that I understand will improve its quality.</p> <p>The article undoubtedly has strengths, and it is innovative in terms of the subject matter. However, several methodological aspects should be better deepened.</p> <p>Introduction: 1. This section is too lengthy, with 91 references. Although the introduction is very informative, as the title suggests, this section should be limited to what the title indicates, and just a brief description and the rationale or objectives of the study will do.</p> <p>2. The second-last paragraph can be shifted to the end of the manuscript (just before the 'Conclusions'), where you can mention the strengths and weaknesses of the study.</p> <p>Statistical Analysis 1. The sample size is impressive. How did you arrive at the sample size calculation? 2. Could you indicate which statistical package you used to conduct the analysis?</p> <p>Further considerations 1. The discussion section is completely missing. A specific section must be inserted, and all the results must be discussed in accordance/discordance with previous literature. 2. Can you better discuss and argue your result concerning the simple index that could be used as an autonomous scale in future studies?</p> <p>Results and Discussion 1. The authors have written the results in detail, with very limited discussion of the findings. I would suggest highlighting the main findings of the study and discussing them in relation to other studies and findings. Literature from the 'Introduction' can be used in the discussion section. 2. At the end of this section, the authors can place a paragraph where the overall findings of the study are discussed. 3. The authors can mention the strengths and limitations of the study at the end of the 'Results and Discussion' section. As mentioned earlier, the second-last paragraph of the 'Introduction' can be used here, to highlight the strengths of the study. The limitations can be taken from the 'Conclusions' and placed here.</p> <p>Conclusions 1. This section is quite lengthy. 2. The limitations of the study don't seem appropriate in this section. Pls refer to my previous comment.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. Yes.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The paper can benefit from language editing and proofreading.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nemer Badwan
Department, University & Country	Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute, Palestine