

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_125560
Title of the Manuscript:	The Future of the CFA Franc: a Game Theory Approach
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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 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.	I like the fact that it used the Game theory which is related to the aim of the article and the fact that it followed the rules of the game in relating it to the area of research. I do not the fact that it manuscript did it include recommendations in the abstract and the fact that it did not use recent literature in its empirical review.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is.	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract is quite adequate but will be robust if the findings are better captured, As the author only stated what the expected outcomes will be given two scenarios. Hence, the results should be captured in a concise manner. 2. The author should not capture the abstract in such structure. It should be a paragraph highlighting the important aspects instead of outlining them as captured. 3. Recommendations were not clearly stated 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	They are appropriate, owing to the fact the cover the main aspects of an academic article.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust giving the fact that it used the Game theory in its approach and followed the step by step mode of play to arrive at it equilibria. Capturing the different aspects Game theory in a robust way makes the article technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	<p>The references captured in the empirical review are not recent. The author is advised to update to recent literature.</p> <p>The reference does not follow a particular referencing style. The author could use APA 7edition. For instance: Gnimassoun B, & Mignon V. (2015). Persistence of current-account disequilibria and real exchange-rate misalignments. <i>Review of International Economics</i>, 23(1):137-59.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English is suitable for scholarly communciation.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ropheka Emerson Bot
Department, University & Country	Bingham University, Nigeria