

Manuscript: “**La política monetaria en presencia de las finanzas islámicas: un estudio exploratorio**”

**Submitted: 01 May 2021**

**Accepted: 16 July 2021**

**Published: 31 July 2021**

Corresponding Author: Joudar Fadoua

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n23p307

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Marco Tulio Cerón López

Universidad IEU (Instituto de Estudios Universitarios), México

**Reviewer 2:** Elsa Aranda Pastrana

Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez, México

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Marco Tulio Cerón López	
University/Country: Universidad IEU (Instituto de Estudios Universitarios) / México	
Date Manuscript Received: 10/05/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/05/2021
Manuscript Title: La política monetaria en presencia de las finanzas islámicas: un estudio exploratorio	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0505/2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>There is a clear relationship between the title of the paper and the development of it.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Yes, they are clear</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>There are no errors, it is written correctly</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The study methods, if they are clearly explained.</b>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>There are no errors, it is written correctly</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The results are clear and are explained in the body of the paper.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Elsa Aranda Pastrana	
University/Country: Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez/México	
Date Manuscript Received: 6/16/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 6/17/2021
Manuscript Title: La política monetaria en presencia de las finanzas islámicas: un estudio exploratorio.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 50.05.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>El título da una idea de lo que trata el trabajo. Las ideas centrales de las preguntas a responder en la página 5 darían un título más preciso.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>En el resumen existen afirmaciones interesantes que no aparecen en el documento.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>El signo ortográfico ":" debe estar seguido de la palabra sin espacio, al igual que la "," en la p.11 párrafo 2. En la p.4, en el párrafo 4 aparece un punto demás. En la página 23 está escrita mal la palabra en el segundo apartado. Algunos títulos de instituciones bancarias no tienen todas las palabras con mayúsculas.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Sí, están bien.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Las referencias no están en orden alfabético. Ahmad, Iqbal y Khan, 1983) no está en las referencias.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**