

Review Form 1.7

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

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	 1. The manuscript addresses a relevant and significant topic regarding the long-term role of equities on cash holdings in the construction firms of Turkey. Analyzing the relationship between equities and cash holdings has implications for financial strategies in the construction sector. The findings could contribute valuable insights to financial decision-making in similar sectors and countries. 2. The current title, "The long-term role of equities on cash holdings of the construction firms in Türkiye," effectively conveys the main focus of the manuscript. However, for conciseness and clarity, an alternative title could be: "Equities and Cash Holdings: A Long-Term Analysis of Turkish Construction Firms" 3. Objectives could be clearer, and the importance of the investigation needs to be highlighted. <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Provide more details on the specific analytical methods used.○ Explicitly mention key results from the returns on assets and returns on equities analysis.○ Include practical implications for construction firms in Turkey.○ Conclude the abstract with a concise summary or takeaway message. 4. The manuscript's structure is generally appropriate, but it could benefit from clearer subsection organization and headings for improved readability. 5. Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the information provided. 6. The references seem sufficient, but the specific references cited are not provided here. Please include the list of references for a more detailed assessment.	 1. We thank and we also highly appreciate the comments and suggestions of the Reviewer. These comments and considerations have enhanced the merit of this work. 2. Title: We have decided to change the current title of the manuscript as: "Equities and Cash Holdings: A Long-Term Analysis of Turkish Construction Firms" as the Reviewer suggests and we appreciate for this excellent suggestion as an alternative to our current title. 3. We reconsidered and highlighted the relevant parts on the manuscript. 4. We appreciate for the positive evaluation of the Reviewer. Nevertheless, we formatted the manuscript following the journal's layout requirements. 5. We hereby thank the Reviewer. 6. The references and citing format are written in accordance with the journal's layout.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication.	We appreciate for the positive evaluation of the Reviewer.
Optional/General comments	The manuscript explores the long-term impact of equities on cash holdings in Turkish construction firms. While generally well-structured, minor improvements are needed in abstract clarity, introduction context, and methodological details.	We appreciate for the positive evaluation of the Reviewer. We have revised the manuscript so as to attain clarity in the abstract, context in the introduction. The methodology used is considered to be as simple as possible along with its conceptual and assumption-based requirements. We offer our gratitude to the comments of the reviewer who helped much in improving the quality of the manuscript. We have considered all of the comments and taken actions where it is necessary. All revised and reconsidered sections are highlighted in the manuscript.

[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)	-