

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_119808
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Optimizing the Allocation of Chinese Family Pension Financial Assets
Type of the Article	manuscript

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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript highlights the changes in the segment. As well as also highlight the interest changes to the script. The author tired to study the impact of it on the investor's behavior. So, he attempted nicely.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Accepted.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In figure one , the researcher tried to highlight future trend , where I am not much clear as not much aware of china's economy. If possible, why he shown the indication need to highlight.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This script is scientifically proper, able to highlight his study properly. Not only that able to elaborate the study with the calculative ground at par. As a reviewer I wish to give boost support to the researcher who attempt with the statistically count and able to contribute for his economic segment.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. -	Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No need.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Urvi Amin
Department, University & Country	SJPI, GTU, India