

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_85075
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Global Financial Crisis on the Palestinian Economy
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.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>I am glad to review and assess this exciting article entitled, “The Impact of Global Financial Crisis on Palestinian Economy”. This investigation is based on the impact of the global financial crisis on the Palestinian economy from 2005 to 2021. The organization of this article is good but unsatisfactory. I suggest that authors need to do a little more careful work to improve the quality of the manuscript.</p> <p>Some valuable comments are given below;</p> <p>1) Abstract and main text are too long, which consist of more than 13,000 words. Hence, prepare the manuscript as per the journal's guidelines. 2) Sadly, the paper does not follow any specific format of writing. Some paragraphs are written in ‘Kalinga’ format and some others are in “Times New Roman”. Similarly, the reference list lacks consistent format writing. Academic writing needs a formal and consistent format of writing and thus, need serious attention to the consistent writing style required for this journal. 3) The manuscript needs language, grammar, and syntactic editing. 4) Provide 5 to 6 keywords instead of 11. 5) Background and introduction sections can be merged into one section, namely, “Introduction” 6) Authors unnecessarily have kept year (in text) in the bracket, which is meaningless. Note that I am not talking about citation year. 7) No mention of how this study is organized, which may bring difficulty for the reader of the article. Therefore, the last paragraph of the first section (Introduction section) provides a brief description of how the rest of the study is organized. 8) The primary defeat of this study is the argument is not clearly stated in the introduction section. 9) Research gap is not evident and not appropriately stated. 10) The list of references is written carelessly. Some references are written in APA format and some others are not. Therefore, authors need to provide a consistent format of all references. 11) Finally, the author needs to revise and improve the quality of the manuscript to publish in the journal.</p>	<p>I am so glad to read these kind words of you as a reviewer and I want to thank you very much for these valuable comments and suggestions. moreover, I would like to thank the reviewer for reviewing my current research paper and to provide me with this valuable peer review report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Thanks a lot, to the reviewer for these valuable comments. These comments have been considered and modified. Done.2. Thanks very much to the reviewer for this great comment. This comment has been considered and modified. Done.3. Thanks very much for this good comment. The manuscript has been modified according to grammatical issues and edited. Done.4. Thank you very much for this good comment. The keywords have been modified and minimized to 6 words. Done.5. Thanks a lot, to the reviewer for this great comment. The background and introduction sections have been merged together and modified well. Done.6. Thank you so much for this kind and valuable comment. This comment has been revised and modified as you requested. Done.7. Thank you very much for this valuable comment. This comment has been considered and revised. Done.8. Thanks a lot for this good comment. This comment has been considered and modified. The argument of the study has been stated clearly as you requested. Done.9. Thank you so much for this good comment. This comment has been considered and revised as should be. The gap of the study now is clearer and appropriately stated. Done.10. Thanks a lot, to the reviewer for this good comment and suggestion. This comment has been taken into consideration and modified. The references list has been revised and modified. Done.11. I would like to thank the reviewer one more time for these great comments and suggestions. Almost all comments and suggestions have been revised and modified as the reviewer requested. Done.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	