



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_10429
Title of the Manuscript:	Accessing the Impact of Monetary Instrument towards Inflation in Malaysia
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	1. The paper has examined the relevance of monetary policy in tackling inflation rate in Malaysia from 1970-2010. 2. Sentences are in most cases disjointed by omitting auxiliary verbs or otherwise. Furthermore, it seems that the author is fun of cut and paste technique which has resulted in too many meaningless sentences of different ideas, e.g. Lines 13-24, 31-41, 78 etc. 3. Sentences and paragraphs lack coherency and smooth flow. 4. Literature is not up-to-date; noting that we are in 2014. 5. The report from Lars (1999) is absolutely incomplete, (see lines 49-53) and Richard et al (1999) from lines 55-58 6. Lines 68-69 have wrong referencing and grammar linkage. 7. The last sentence in line 62-63 does not make better grammar at all. In fact, the paper is generally suffering from grammatical errors. 8. The introduction and Literature review are absolutely inadequate. 9. The methodology needs some panel-beating. I.e. the abbreviated variables must be clearly stated before they are grouped in the regression equation and the log of these can only be taken after the ideal unit root tests	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	because the log of the variables do not necessarily eliminate Heteroskedasticity as u profess but if u are sure, then give supportive evidence by testing for Heteroskedasticity. 10. Line 156 requires referencing evidence on how the PP is stronger than Augmented Dickey-Fuller or Dickey-Fuller tests. 11. Lines 183-184 has Latifah (2004) and Fahad and Svetlana (2010) which are not found in the literature earlier reviewed. The discussion is not elaborate and does not capture other studies.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. I suppose, when the VECM is used, in most cases the IRF and the VD is not necessary. 2. Line 313 "...in our country..." is not right. 3. Line 320 should read "...to use under monetary policy to..." 4. Some authors appear in the references but were not used in the work while some were used in the work but are not in the references, e.g Chimobi and Igwe (2010), Arief (2007), Khalid (2005), etc- pls revisit.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer