

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_120896
Title of the Manuscript:	Volatility of bitcoin prices and the volatility of exchange rates in oil-producing countries
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study bridges multiple disciplines including finance, economics and data science. This study provides insights for the scientific community by showing how modern days market instruments such as Bitcoin responds and interact with traditional financial markets and economies of 10 oil-producing nations. The analysis on the volatility Bitcoin on local currencies highlights the interconnectedness and points out the potential risks associated with digital currencies. The information obtained from this study can be useful to both scientific community as well as investment community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Overall, the title is good. However, the author can consider the title below: Volatility of bitcoin prices and the volatility of exchange rates in oil-producing countries: ARIMA & GARCH Approach	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is good and sufficient. However, please check for some typo errors i.e., heteroscedasticity	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Overall, the article is well structured, and all the subsections are appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Overall, the manuscript is good. One suggestion is that the author could have used multiple windows for forecasting i.e., 25%, 50%, and 75%. By doing so, it may increase the robustness of the findings and on top of that readers might gain extra information on how Bitcoin affects the exchange rate in various windows. The usage of ARIMA and GARCH in this study is correct and technically sound. The findings also suggest that Bitcoin trading can attract FDI which in return can stimulate the economic growth and productivity which is actually true.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent below the 5-year window. Except for Tapscott, D., & Tapscott, A. (2016). No additional references is required.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the English level is good.	
Optional/General comments	No comments.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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:	Joel Raj Francis
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Malaysia