

Paper: “The Impact of Takaful Insurance on the Manufacturing Industry in Malaysia: Empirical Evidence through ARDL Bounds Testing Approach”

Submitted: 22 September 2023

Accepted: 24 October 2023

Published: 31 October 2023

Corresponding Author: Achmakou Lahoucine

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n28p112](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n28p112)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Robert Szucs
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Rajko Odobasa
University of Osijek, Faculty of Law, Croatia

Reviewer 3: Peter Arhenful
Accounting and Finance Department, Accra Technical University, Accra, Ghana

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is concise and appropriate for the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is concise and clearly outlines the purpose, methodology, and findings of the study.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The grammatical structure of the text is satisfactory. No instances of spelling errors have been observed.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The research method should be clearly stated in the main work. The statistical software used for model estimation should be specified. Meanwhile, because secondary data was used, the data sources cannot be the author's own calculations or development. If the author used Eviews Statistical Software, for example, the source could be stated as: Eviews Output, 2023.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is unambiguous. However, the majority of the literatures are older than 2017, with 2021 being the most recent. I propose that two or three works from 2022 and 2023 be added to make the work more current.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is not entirely satisfactory. In addition to presenting the findings, it is imperative to provide a concise summary of the methods employed and the objectives pursued in the study. The absence of the study's limitations is also evident.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The referencing is inconsistent. It is difficult to tell whether the author is referencing in APA, MLA, or Harvard style. For example, while inverted commas have been used in some cases, they are not used in others. As a result, the author must adhere to a single referencing style. Furthermore, references must be justified.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer R:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title of the paper is clear and corresponds to the content of the article. It would probably be opportune to put in the title the period to which the research refers.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The subject, methods and results of the research are clearly articulated in the summary.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Among the grammatical and spelling errors, the following stand out:

- The graphics (figures) are not exactly numbered, and some are described in French (the main text is in English).
- Some sentences start with lowercase letters, which affects the clarity of the text.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods are clearly explained.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is transparent, although numerical marking of parts of the paper would help in transparency and accuracy.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is correct and consistent with the previously presented content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is extensive and appropriate.

- In the list, the font of the listed titles should be uniform.

- The numbering of pages from the used sources should also be standardized - some sources lack page numbers from the original journals/books.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper could highlight the fact that the analysis was carried out before the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic and the war in Ukraine, which means that important global economic disturbances could affect the conclusions in the paper. It is likely that this fact will be investigated in the continuation of the longitudinal research. The fact that Figure 3 (incorrectly marked with 2) shows that after 2018 the correlation between manufacturing production and Takaful insurance operator's assets is intriguing.

Reviewer S:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title provides a clear indication of the content, mentioning the specific focus on the impact of Takaful insurance on the manufacturing industry in Malaysia.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract provides a concise summary of the paper's objectives, methods, and key findings. It gives a clear overview of the research conducted the impact of Takaful

insurance on the manufacturing industry in Malaysia. The results show a positive and significant impact of the increase in Takaful contributions on manufacturing activity.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Based on the provided text, the paper demonstrates a good level of language proficiency with minimal grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. However, a thorough proofreading and editing process could further improve the overall quality of the language and eliminate any remaining errors. E.g. Figure 3 is in French.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The paper clearly describes the methodology used, e.g. specification of ARDL model. It also provides detailed information on methodology used (Stationarity tests for variables).

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The paper presents clear results, indicating the impact of Takaful insurance on the manufacturing industry in Malaysia. In some places, a small methodological addition would help the article's processability and comprehensibility. The paper is difficult to digest, dense.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusions accurately summarize the findings of the study, emphasizing the impact of Takaful insurance on the manufacturing industry in Malaysia. The conclusions are supported by the information presented throughout the paper.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The paper includes a list of references, providing sources that are relevant to the topic

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In some places, a small methodological addition would help the article's processability and comprehensibility. The paper is difficult to digest, dense. With

these small modifications, the the quality of tha paper can be even better, but the quality is still good.
