

---

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 26 <sup>th</sup> Jan 2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 31 <sup>st</sup> Jan 2016
Manuscript Title: <b>Stock returns and volatility in an emerging equity market. Evidence from Kenya</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0213/16	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> <b>Proper research gap should be identified</b>	
<b>5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
<b>6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

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

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

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

This sheet is to be returned to the author(s) of the manuscript. Please provide reasons for acceptance or rejection as well as any suggestions that you might feel are appropriate for revisions or improvements. **The paper is well written and comprehensive. Despite that, there are areas where minor revision is necessary.**

- **Page 2, second paragraph – second line, you mention “securities firms”, this should be “firms” as securities are just shares.**
- **Page 2 – second last paragraph, CAPM is Capital Asset Pricing Model in full.**
- **Page 5 – Clearly explain the parameters of the equations to make it easy to follow. For instance, what are the dummies, why are they necessary or what do they capture?**
- **Page 5 - Change Integrated AGRCH to Integrated GARCH.**
- **Page 5 – The equations need to be consistent in use and meaning of notations. In equation (8),  $i$  ranges from 1 to  $p$  but the parameter used is  $\beta_j h_{t-j}$ . Also, in equations (4) and (8), use of parameters has been swapped for  $i$  and  $j$ .**
- **Page 5 – The GARCH-in-mean(1,1) equation is missing.**
- **Page 6 – Check use of different nations  $\gamma_i$  and  $\lambda$  in equations (12) and (13).**
- **Since daily data is used in the study, are the start dates of policy and institutional dummies identified at the day of implementation or generalized to the entire year e.g. D2006? If this is**

**the case, then how does it affect interpretation of the results?**

- **Provide clear explanation of the results presented to the extent that their implication comes out clearly.**
- **What are the policy implications of your findings?**

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**The paper is well written. The authors should address the comments to make the paper clearer and justify its policy impact as one of the justifications of the paper is on the policy front.**

