



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_44988
Title of the Manuscript:	Payoffs from neutral option strategies: A study of USD-INR market
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	There were typographical and few grammatical errors, in addition, there were some numbers in brackets in some sentences that were not making sense, for instance, Between the financial years 205 and 2017, cash market turnover has increased by 1.4% on anual compounding basis, while future and option turnover has risen by 35% compounded anually [1]. The [1] is not necessary, i could see a lot of numbers like this in parenthesis in most sentences. Moreover some authors were quoted without the year they made the statement, for instance Goltz & Lai and Coperland & Galai were quoted without the year in bracket when they made the statement	All the corrections listed by the reviewer has been done. Parenthesis have been removed. Changes mentioned by the reviewer have been highlighted in the yellow colour.
Minor REVISION comments	The author should look at the following lines: Line 29 – Between the financial years 205 and 2017, cash market turnover has increased by 1.4% on anual compounding basis, while future and option turnover has risen by 35% compounded anually [1]. [1] should be removed Line 30 – [15] should be removed Line 34,replace kind with kinds Line 35 replace strangle with strangles Line 36 replace cost with costs The author should look at line 37, 39,41, 43, 45, 46, 49, 52, 54,55, 58, 59, 65, 70, 71. 80, 86, 88, 89, 90,96, 99, 100, 105, 108, 112, 113, 115, 122, 124, 125, 129, 130, 133, 134, 139, 196, 216, 224, 253. These lines have little grammatical issues, for line 43, it should be expire not expires. In addition, the numbers in [] parenthesis should be removed in some of lines listed. Furthermore, the author should bring each table before the explanation, not explanation before the table, so the table can guide the reader when he is reading the explanation. For instance, table 2 should come after line 229, then the explanation starts at line 130 In the conclusion the author did not proffer any recommendation on how to improve his study. He should offer at least one recommendation based on his findings	Parenthesis have been removed. Changes have been made in all the lines mentioned by the reviewer and same have been highlighted in the yellow colour in the manuscript. Tables have been put before the explanation. Recommendation has been added in the conclusion section as suggested by the reviewer.
Optional/General comments	The author can use thesaurus in his/her laptop to help in checking the grammatical errors, appropriate use of punctuation, so that the grammatical errors can be reduced. The author should check the lines I indicated and look at the sentences again and remove the numbers in parenthesis cause i did not see their relevance in the sentences	Parenthesis have been removed. All the grammatical errors has been removed. Manuscript has been improved.

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No, there are no ethical issues in the manuscript.

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>