

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_105409
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants of Real Effective Exchange Rate
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> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes the manuscript is important for scientific community</p> <p>2. The title should rather read as "Determinants of Real Effective Exchange Rate: Evidence from Emerging African Countries"</p> <p>3. The abstract need to be revised. It exceed 300 word based on the journal guideline instead the manuscript have 589 words. Also the key words are so many and are not arrange in alphabetical order based on the Journal guidelines.</p> <p>4. Of course yes</p> <p>5. yes</p> <p>6. They are not sufficient. The authors need to provide more in the literature review as well as in discussing the findings to support their own result.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, however the manuscript needs to be edited by language professional to improve the quality of the manuscript flows.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Actually, the manuscript is good but has some defects such as lack of scholarly citation especially in the introduction part of the manuscript. There is no a single citation and it seems like a story narration. So this needs to be improved by the authors. Similarly, the manuscript is not adhered to the any version of APA referencing style intent citation this also needs to be revisited. Finally, the references are absolutely poor and did not meet any APA style and are not listed in alphabetical order. Therefore, author shall re do it completely to reflect the proper APA referencing style.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zakariyau Gurama</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Gombe State University, Nigeria</b>