

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_95699
Title of the Manuscript:	The Risk of Capital Flight on Economic Growth and National Solvency: An Empirical Evidence from Palestine
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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research issues are ambiguous.</li> </ul> <p><u>Suggestion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To highlight clearly the research issues related to capital flight of the sample country.</li> <li>• To include either graphical presentation or statistical facts about the trend of capital flight of the sample country.</li> </ul> <p><b>Literature Review</b></p> <p>Under 2.2 Empirical Literature Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This section is too lengthy and may cause difficulty for readers to understand.</li> </ul> <p><u>Suggestion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider to classify the literature discussion into sub-topic, for example, Developed Countries and another one is Developing Countries</li> </ul> <p><b>Methodology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are inconsistencies of notation used in the model specification.</li> </ul> <p>Under 3.2 Methodology and Model Specifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equation (2), (3), (5) &amp; (7) – should be with 't'</li> </ul> <p><u>Suggestion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They should be stated as time-series analysis with subscript 't', instead of 'it' or 'i'.</li> <li>• To provide benefits of employing ARDL method in this case.</li> </ul> <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Under Table 2: Unit Root Test of Augmented Dickey-Fuller &amp; Table 3: Unit Root Test of Phillips-Perron</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The results presented are around 1 for Level and First Difference, which do not make sense.</li> </ul> <p>Statement under 4.2 The Coefficients of the Long-Run on page 15: In addition, a 1% increase in capital flight causes an economic growth drop of 4%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not consistent with the results presented in Table 5.</li> </ul> <p>Statement under 4.3 Estimated Corrections for Errors on page 16: This indicates that lagging period error shocks in the present period are used to correct 48% of the long-run disequilibrium.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not consistent with the results presented in Table 6 for the speed of adjustment.</li> </ul> <p><u>Suggestion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must check again or consider transforming the variables into logarithm and re-rerun.</li> <li>• Need to check the results discussion so that consistent with the empirical results.</li> <li>• To discuss the short-run results.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jerome Kueh Swee Hui</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universiti Malaysia Sarawak, Malaysia</b>