

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_113294
Title of the Manuscript:	LEVERAGING ON FINTECH DATA MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE TO REDUCE CRYPTOCURRENCY VOLATILITY, ENSURING THE SECURITY OF US EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT BENEFIT: A CASE OF BITCOIN ETF APPROVAL.
Type of the Article	

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>1. Yes, the manuscript is important to scientific community. However, few of the details should be highlighted more. Below are the key improvement for the article:</p> <p>(a) The article use quantitative and qualitative analysis. However, in the article, most portion of it are focusing on the introduction and literature review; as well as the references. Whereas, the segment methodology and findings is very minimal.</p> <p>(b) In the method section, number of respondents is presence, but the population are not highlighted. The sample is selected based on what method to ensure it is valid for generality? Is the population comes from a particular region, or the whole of the country? Please detail out how you get your sample.</p> <p>(c) In the finding section, only final results are presented in table forms. Analysis leading to the final findings are not presence, and not much availability on the way the research is being conducted.</p> <p>(d) In the finding section also, no discussion and findings available for the qualitative data. There is no thematic assessment, as well as no discussion on the result of some open ended questions.</p> <p>(e) The reference is too much, and does not jive with the article. It is more suited to reference for the dissertation.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is sufficient. I see only few typo (missing full stop) in the document.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Masnita Misiran
Department, University & Country	Centre for Testing, Measurement & Appraisal, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia