



Paper: “A Multi-Dimensional Analysis of Stock Market Dynamics for 10 Leading US Companies: 2022 -2023”

Submitted: 05 January 2025

Accepted: 10 February 2025

Published: 28 February 2025

Corresponding Author: Aleksandra Klaczyk

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n4p35

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Robert Szucs
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Rashidat Ayanbanke Busari
Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen, UK

Reviewer 3: Amir Mohammad Sohrabian
International Information Technology University (IITU), Kazakhstan

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Dr. Róbert Sándor Szűcs	
University/Country: University of Debrecen, Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 15.01.2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 19.01.2025
Manuscript Title: Analyzing Stock Market Dynamics for 10 Leading US Companies: A Multi-Dimensional Approach Using Time Series and Correlation Analysis	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0140/25	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title precisely reflects the article's content by indicating the focus on stock market dynamics for leading US companies using a multi-dimensional analytical approach. It effectively communicates the scope and methodologies of the study.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
The abstract clearly outlines the objectives, methodologies (e.g., time series and correlation analyses), and key findings of the study. It succinctly conveys the research's contribution and implications for stock market analysis.	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
While the article is generally well-written, minor issues such as repetitive phrases (e.g., "A diverse range of individuals" used twice in succession) and occasional typographical errors were noted. These errors do not detract significantly from comprehension.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The article provides a detailed explanation of the methods, including data collection, preparation, and analysis (e.g., normalization, GARCH modeling, descriptive statistics). This ensures reproducibility and transparency in research.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results are presented clearly with supportive tables, figures, and statistical data. They align with the research objectives, and there is no evidence of inaccuracies in the reported findings.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions are well-founded and directly derived from the analysis. They provide meaningful insights and practical implications while acknowledging limitations, which enhances their credibility.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references include seminal works (e.g., Fama, Granger, Bollerslev) and recent literature. They are relevant and support the theoretical and methodological framework of the study.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This article demonstrates a high standard of academic rigor and relevance, with minor areas for improvement in grammar and style. It effectively contributes to the field of stock market analysis through robust methodologies and insightful results.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Rashidat Busari	
University/Country: Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen, UK	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/01/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/01/2025
Manuscript Title: Analyzing Stock Market Dynamics for 10 Leading US Companies: A Multi-Dimensional Approach Using Time Series and Correlation Analysis	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 13, 40-01-2025	
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: 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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
Please consider this title: A Multi-Dimensional Analysis of Stock Market Dynamics for 10 Leading US Companies: 2022 -2023.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
The reporting of the result is not explicit. Provide the statistical information about the result, the study conclusion and recommendation.	

Consider the following keywords: Stock market dynamics, US Companies, Stock prices, Multi-Dimensional	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
There were no noticeable grammatical errors or spelling mistakes, errors were quite minimal	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The study methods are not clearly explained in this section. To improve clarity, the methodology section should be organized into distinct paragraphs addressing the following aspects: stylized facts, sampling procedure and sample size, type and method of data collection, method of data analysis, model specification and estimation procedure.	
Additionally, as the dataset appears to be panel data, it is recommended to adopt a panel analytical approach for more robust and accurate analysis.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
Some Part of result like Skewness and kurtosis, and Jarque-Bera are missing. The result should follow a pattern of presentation reflecting the objective and methodology. The statistical interpretation of the result is not very adequate.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
This should reflect the summary of the result accordingly and some recommendation where necessary.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Some in-cite references are missing. E.g. Chung and Zhao (2019) while some listed are not cited.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	Yes
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Based the comments in each session above, kindly effect this minor revision. These revisions will significantly improve the quality and clarity of the document, enhancing its overall impact.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: