

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_129655
Title of the Manuscript:	Behavioral Finance in Banking and Management
Type of the Article	research

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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Current Title: Behavioral Finance in Banking and Management	
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.	As a research paper, the methodology section is amissed. Is it possible to include the data gathering methods used to emerge the results and discussions of the study?	edited
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	In keeping with the Introduction-Methods-Results and Discussion framework of writing a research paper, the study is wanting coherence. The research gap needs to be highlighted to justify the significance of the study. Particular attention is needed in terms of the research objectives aligned with the methods leading to the discussion of the study and pertinent conclusion. To strengthen this, recast the flow of ideas following the IMRAD framework.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are not within the 5-year recency of literature. Developments in the topic of interest must have had more recent discussions and findings beyond the 1990s or early 2000s. Update references and citations included in the text.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The fluidity of the narrative needs to be reviewed particularly on statements that have been repeated throughout the text. Avoid redundancy.	
Optional/General comments	NO competing interest issues in this manuscript NO ethical issues were noted Major revision on the following: (a) Update review of related and relevant literature (b) Check fluidity of discussion avoiding redundant phrases and sentences (c) IMRAD framework is not followed. Background of the study needs to highlight the research gap and research objectives Methods section is not included pertaining to research design. Clarify if the paper is quantitative or qualitative and how this was done and achieved.	

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)	