

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_84564
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF AUDIT COMMITTEE CHARACTERISTICS ON REAL EARNINGS MANAGEMENT THROUGH ABNORMAL CASH FLOW
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>)

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The first paragraph of the introduction should give the reader the global perspective of the subject matter before gradually coming down to area of study.</li><li>2. Abstract should be written in one single paragraph and all concept abbreviations should be reduced.</li><li>3. Citations should include recent literatures.</li><li>4. Methodology needs to be reviewed; the study should have research design, justification for base year of 2016</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. In the first paragraph, I to updated it by providing issues related to the global accounting scandals down to my area of study.</li><li>2. The abstract has been updated in a single paragraph.</li><li>3. Citation of recent literatures has been included.</li><li>4. Methodology has been reviewed by providing example of research design and justification for the base year 2016.</li></ol> <b>The areas of corrections and review has been highlighted in the attached file and references has also been updated.</b>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The study should go through editorial	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The author made a good attempt on the subject matter by creating a gap that was sufficiently filled.	

### 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)	