

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_114642
Title of the Manuscript:	Empirical evidence on the validity of the Conditional Higher Moment CAPM in the Bombay Stock Exchange
Type of the Article	Original Research 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> <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 is important for the scientific community if the research sample is expanded beyond just the Bombay Stock Exchange. Since I did not find an explanation of the reasons for conducting observations on the Bombay Stock Exchange, this should be explained in detail in the background section, but I did not find it. 2. The title of this manuscript is "Empirical evidence of the validity of the CAPM Conditional Higher Moment on the Bombay Stock Exchange." However, the abstract explains that the conditional high moment CAPM cannot be validated in the Indian context, resulting in a lack of synchronization between the title and the findings. If it cannot be validated in India then why do research in India? 3. The abstract is explained quite comprehensively, including the sample, observation period, methods used, and findings. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are quite appropriate. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. The references sufficient and recent. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The quality of articles in language/English is suitable for scientific communication 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The idea in this research is interesting, but the explanation in the manuscript as a whole needs to be explained more comprehensively, such as in the background it would be better to add an explanation of the reasons for observing in India.</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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shindy Dwita Nuansari
Department, University & Country	Universitas Alma Ata, Indonesia