

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_103596
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of U.S. Quantitative Easing (QE) Announcements on Indian Government Bond Yields
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript brings relevant contribution to macro-economic and economic policy knowledge.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract comprises contextualization, objectives, methodology and results.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate. It shows introduction, literature review, data and empirical methodology, empirical results and discussion and conclusion.</p> <p>5. The manuscript literature review is very robust, explaining all the economic concepts presented in the discussion. The methodology is very well described and permits the achievement of the aims proposed. The results are clearly presented and the discussions are based on the arguments presented in the literature review. The conclusion shows that the aim was achieved.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is satisfactory for scholarly communications. A correction is needed: - Figure 5 repeats the information of figure 4. It is not showing Indian 3-month and 10-year treasury yields during QE periods.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is very well written, with valid and reliable results. Congratulations to the authors.</p>	

PART 2:

	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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Agnaldo Keiti Higuch
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal dos Vales do Jequitinhonha e Mucuri, Brasil