

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_92531
Title of the Manuscript:	PERFORMANCE OF ISLAMIC BANKS USING THE ISLAMICITY PERFORMANCE INDEX APPROACH ON ISLAMIC BANKS IN INDONESIA AND MALAYSIA
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.journalajebo.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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delete the research hypothesis section if the study is purely qualitative. However, if the study is quantitative, author should rewrite the section. 2. Even though author categorizes the study as qualitative, in the Data Analysis section, author discusses analysing data quantitatively. It will be better if this is clarified. In my estimation, this is a quantitative study. 3. If agreed that it is quantitative then there should be a section that clearly explains how the author analyses the data, i.e, Method of Data Analysis, in this case means testing. 4. Author should explain the conceptual framework. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The discussions on t-tests (Table 4, 6 and 8) could be simplified and straightforward to help readers follow the discussions. The authors should provide intuition and justification for the results instead of the lengthy discussions on the statistics. I think discussing the t-statistics alone is enough to show the statistical significance. 6. It will be helpful to readers if authors provide some potential reasons for the result. 	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bright Osei
Department, University & Country	University of Mississippi, USA