

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_126785
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Exchange Rate Volatility on Sectoral Output in Liberia
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 believe this manuscript is important for the scientific community and might help the government of Liberia in outlining their monetary policies. The exchange rate might have direct impact to economic stability of the countries especially for agriculture and manufacturing sectors.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, Suitable enough.	
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.	Comprehensive enough	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It's a bit too long. Would be good if can be shorten lesser than 15 pages.	
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.	Method and analysis applied are statistically appropriated and technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient enough	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Should be improved	
Optional/General comments	The quality of the English should be improved for scholarly manuscript	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ferri Bin Nasrul
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia