

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_100589
Title of the Manuscript:	Benefits and constraints associated with the harmonization of financial regulations: An overview.
Type of the Article	Review 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

	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>Yes, the present manuscript delves into an incredibly relevant and important topic for the scientific community. Harmonizing financial regulations is vital for ensuring stability and uniformity in financial systems, and this manuscript offers valuable insights into the benefits and challenges of this process.</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article is perfectly suitable, as it accurately reflects the subject matter of the manuscript.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and provides a clear overview of the manuscript's main points and findings.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be fitting and well-organized, which makes it easy to follow the authors' argument. The constraints and Challenges section can be improved.</p> <p>The manuscript seems scientifically sound but as a review paper, this requires adequately supported by relevant research and evidence.</p> <p>The references provided in the document are insufficient in view of being a review paper, which is not satisfactory to support the content. I suggest including more recent references and increasing the number of references to improve the quality of the document. Reference must be rewritten. Abbreviations and definitions must not be included in the references list but rather provide separately</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This paper was well-written and informative. The author provided great insights on the topic and backed their arguments with solid evidence from a few reliable sources. However, I would suggest adding more references and recommendations to further support the claims made in the paper. Additionally, a more comprehensive conclusion based on various prior research would certainly enhance the paper's value and make it more impactful. Overall, this paper has a lot of potential and with a few minor improvements.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shingla Prabha
Department, University & Country	Vaishali Mahila College, B. R. A. Bihar University, India