

Review of: "Sectoral Herding Contagion on Eve of New Year"

Mario Coccia¹

¹ Italian National Research Council

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Sectoral Herding Contagion on Eve of New Year

The topics of this paper are interesting. The structure and content must be revised, and results have to be better explained by authors.

Title has to clear about the results or aim. It can indicate that is a comparison USA and China.

Abstract has to clarify goal, results and managerial and policy implications.

Introduction has to better clarify the research questions of this study and provide more theoretical background. After that they can focus on the topics of this study to provide a correct analysis for fruitful discussion (See suggested readings).

Literature review can be reinforced.

Hypotheses have to be clarified about what they can explain.

Relationships between HPs have to be represented in a graph with arrows.

Methods of this study is not clear. The section of Materials and methods must be re-structured with following three sections only and same order:

- Sample and data
- Measures of variables
- Models and Data analysis procedure.

Authors have to avoid subheadings that create fragmentation and confusion. If necessary, can use bullet points (same comments for section of results and all sections).

Results.

To reiterate, avoiding in the just mentioned sections, sub-headings that create fragmentation of the paper.

Insert a note to table 1 to clarify acronyms and terms of first line.

Table 2-12 also insert F-test and its significance.

The paper has a lot of tables that are difficult to digest, some of them can be put in appendix and inserting in the text the most important ones to improve the readability...

Discussion.

First, authors have to synthesize the main results in a simple table to be clear for readers and then show what this study adds compared to other studies. A discussion about incentive management to design best practices to face similar issue in stock markets associated with institutional changes can reinforce the study.

Conclusion has not to be a summary, but authors have to focus on manifold limitations of this study and provide suggestions of management to face these issues in stock markets.

Overall, then, the paper is interesting. Theoretical framework; study design, discussion and presentation of results can be clarified using suggested comments.

Thanks.

Suggested readings:

Baddeley M. (2010). Herding, social influence and economic decision-making: socio-psychological and neuroscientific analyses. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological sciences*, 365(1538), 281–290. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2009.0169>

Coccia M. 2019. Intrinsic and extrinsic incentives to support motivation and performance of public organizations, *Journal of Economics Bibliography*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 20-29, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1453/jeb.v6i1.1795>

Shrotryia, V.K., Kalra, H. 2014. Herding in the crypto market: a diagnosis of heavy distribution tails. *Review of Behavioral Finance*, 14(5), pp. 566–587

Coccia M. 2019. Comparative Incentive Systems. A. Farazmand (ed.), *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*, Springer, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_3706-1

Teng, Y.-P., Liu, Y.A. 2014. The study of herding behavior among the Greater China Stock Markets during Financial Crisis. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Mathematics*, 17(2), pp. 163–197

Coccia M. 2019. Comparative Institutional Changes. A. Farazmand (ed.), *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*, Springer Nature, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_1277-1

Ghorbel, A., Boujelbene, M.A., Boujelbene, Y. 2014. Behavioral explanation of contagion between oil and stock markets. *International Journal of Energy Sector Management*, 8(1), pp. 121–144