



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>-1<b>First</b> of all, exactly, what data were used (not "will be collected"? A simple data series was sufficient to understand.</p> <p>-2<b>The studies</b> regarding the statistical formulas and technicalities should be more explained.</p> <p>- 3<b>Indeed</b>, which is soft used, if there are recommendations regarding the use of the formulas and statistical tools by those working in the field?</p> <p>-4<b>The</b> name of tools used should be written with capital letter at the beginning of the name: Sortino, Treynor,....</p> <p>-5<b>It's too</b> technically written. The people working in the field, also the analysts should economically understand the phenomena, of course based on programmes (soft) used.</p>	<p>-1<b>As per</b> my understanding data collection word is objected due to secondary data in nature. In this regards collected word has been replaced with "used".</p> <p>-2<b>More</b> discussion on adopted statistical formulas has been added into paper and highlighted with yellow colours.</p> <p>-3<b>Yes</b>, Author of this study adopted these formulas from well reputed research papers and it has been practical observation, they have been used by the working professionals in their respective field, particularly finance.</p> <p>-4<b>Suggestion</b> has been incorporated and changes are made.</p> <p>-5<b>This is</b> a formal research article and author of this study believe that it should be technically written with respect to research requirement. Furthermore, it will be highly appreciated if editor point out a portion from the article for the re-written in simple language.</p>