

Review Form 1.8

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_120189
Title of the Manuscript:	Empirical Study on the Impact of Monetary Policy on the Adjustment of Corporate Capital Structure under the Environment of Financial Development
Type of the Article	Research article

Review Form 1.8

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	Yes. It is empirical and data were collected and analyzed. Models were stated to help in the analysis. The study is SMART – Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Time-bound.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The study should simply be: Impact of Monetary Policy on the Adjustment of Corporate Capital Structure under the Environment of Financial Development.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	No. An abstract should capture the title (main objective of the study in clear terms), specific objectives, research methodology/design used, method of analysis, findings, conclusion, and recommendation. Contribution to knowledge should also be mentioned.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	Yes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The references are sufficient and relevant.	

Review Form 1.8

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	The article has the qualities of a good research material.	1.
	The study is empirical so it does not need to be part of the title.	2.
	A well written abstract should be more detailed and captivating and be able to arrest the attention of the reader. Therefore, the author should use past tense because the abstract is a summary intended to report a study that has been concluded.	3.
	The subsections are well written. However, there was no pagination. Secondly, the paragraphs appear to be too lengthy. Long sentences make reading too boring. A paragraph should express only one idea at a time. The margins should be well justified (See page 5).	4.
	There is room for improvement being that 100% precision is not attainable.	5.
	The author can bring up more recent references between 2022 and 2023.	6.
	Minor corrections are important.	7.
	8. Table 1 should be sent to Appendix 1 Referencing style should follow the established and most recent standards e.g. APA 7	9.

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>	

[Review Form 1.8](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Godwin Oghenekohwo Akparhuere
Department, University & Country	Federal School of Statistics, Nigeria