

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_118495
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on the effect of China's direct investment on countries along the Belt and Road based on RMB internationalization
Type of the 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript aims to illustrate the impact of RMB internationalization on China's Belt and Road investment. In the abstract, the author states that the Panel model is used, but it's confusing which effect of panel model is used. While this manuscript seems to display a well academical structure and show as a well practical study, It's so weak empirical findings by the undefined description of Panel's fixed or random effects model, that it is difficult to understand the significance of the estimates and to distrust the results, generated by analyzing data with countries and time simultaneously. If authors reply they used fixed effect model of Panel data, they should show the fixed effect outcomes and might work the random effect outcomes because readers do not know which model is good to explain the data. Authors should own more academic responsibility to let readers know they correctly run the fixed effect and random effect models of Panel data, and also correctly interpret the statistical outcomes. 2. Yes. 3. Yes. 4. Please let the authors know the manuscript translated from Chinese is hard to read and the sections are hard to read. 5. <p>This manuscript used the data of China with 141 countries (labelled by i) along the Belt and Road from 2010 to 2022 (labelled by t and total of 13). By equations (1) ~ (4), different countries would show four estimated equations. However, the descriptive statistic table (Tab. 2) display the pooled outcomes, I suspect what the authors intend to express. It let me very confused how authors can merge different regions and different time records in one estimated equation (see Tab. 3).</p> <p>The abstract has had shown the "Panel" model, but the content or model description did not show any "panel model", so does the results. I have read it and suspected all the samples are pooled into the equations and run the outcomes.</p> <p>6. Since the variable, "Dis," in the manuscript, the authors did not cite the literature of "Gravity Model of Trade."</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The use of bibliographic software resulted in errors in the formatting of the names of the people cited in bibliographic references throughout the manuscript. Eg. the second line of Page 4 shows "LipseyanWeiss(1984), WongandGoh(2013) et al." with wrong spelling format.</p> <p>The author was unaware of those mistakes and seems that they did not check the contents of the manuscript. The manuscript is very unsatisfactory for reading.</p> <p>Fig. 1 has no labels of each axis.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mei-Yu Lee
Department, University & Country	Yuanpei University of Medical Technology, Taiwan