

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_111135
Title of the Manuscript:	<p>The long-term role of equities on cash holdings of the construction firms in Türkiye</p> <p>"Equities and Cash Holdings: A Long-Term Analysis of Turkish Construction Firms"</p> <p>We have decided to change the current title of the manuscript as one of the Reviewers suggests.</p>
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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://www.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The abstract is not comprehensive.</p> <p>Could not be evaluated because of the poor English.</p> <p>It is scientifically relevant</p> <p>The number of references is sufficient, but only few are current</p> <p>The article does not have the following sections: Literature review and Recommendations. The two sections should be added.</p>	<p>The comments and suggestions of the Reviewer have added much to the quality of the manuscript. Therefore, we hereby thank and we also highly appreciate the efforts of the Reviewer.</p> <p>We have revised the abstract of the manuscript and highlighted the sections where it is necessary to take actions.</p> <p>We have reread the manuscript and we have tried to improve the language and we also considered all the notes on the word file which was attached by the Reviewer. Moreover, we highlighted these parts.</p> <p>We hereby thank the Reviewer because the manuscript has been found scientifically relevant by the Reviewer.</p> <p>We thank the Reviewer that he or she had found the references sufficient.</p> <p>We formatted the manuscript following the most used sections in the articles on the journal along with the journal's layout requirements. Literature review and recommendations are given in the introduction, findings and discussion; and conclusions sections respectively.</p> <p>We have reconsidered the references after the Reviewer's comments. However, the references cannot be given in alphabetical order as noted in the word file which is attached by the Reviewer. As a result of journal's layout requirements, we had to give the references in serial numbering format.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English is not suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	<p>We have reread the manuscript and we have tried to improve the language in accordance with the notes mentioned by the Reviewer in his or her word file which is attached to the reviewer's comments. We have changed the title of the manuscript. Nevertheless, we highlighted the parts revised throughout the manuscript.</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript should be given to a native English speaker to re-write.</p>	<p>The necessary upgrading is realized on the manuscript and the quality of the language has been improved as much as possible.</p> <p>We have considered all of the comments and taken actions where it is necessary. All revised and reconsidered sections are highlighted in the manuscript.</p>

Review Form 1.7

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)	-