

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting                |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJEBA_99195   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Impact of Financial Support on Transforming China's Energy Economy |
| 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments<br>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)<br>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)<br>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b><br>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b><br>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b><br>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b><br><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b> | Yes<br>Yes<br>Yes<br>Yes<br>Yes<br>1. Author has to check the used tenses in the part of entire methodology. It seems like given in future tense which usually developed with past. Eg. 1st sentence in the 2nd paragraph of 3.2.<br>2. The research questions have not fulfilled as findings of the study.<br>3. Interpretation below the tables simply cited the tables as 'The above table' instead of mentioning the number of table. Author has to check it and cite it properly.<br>4. 2.1 under literature review is not to be given there. Just move it to introduction part or skip it.<br>5. The study is hugely lacks of data with analytical reports which make cross checking with given research questions and objectives. |   |
| <b>Minor REVISION</b> comments<br>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>   | Yes  |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> 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? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) |   |

### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |                                   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Name:                            | T. Amose                          |
| Department, University & Country | Madurai Kamaraj University, India |