Review of: "Risk-Return Analysis of Select Crypto Currencies: During 2018-2022"

Max Menzies[1]

1 Tsinghua University

Since v1, the author has added some formalities such as keywords, objectives, declarations, that serve as the scaffolding for a scientific paper. This is good. And the author has made some improvements to the English writing. Good. However, almost all my previous comments remain. The standard of English still needs considerable improvement. There is still no data source provided - "web resources" is not a source (whereas coinmarketcap.com is a source, for example). There are still too few citations in the period of 2018-2022. And there is little analysis other than commentary and description of the price movements. The author has uploaded a new version very quickly, but should take time to address all the recommendations of this review and the other reviews already received. Review of v1 below in abridged form:

1) This paper must be comprehensively edited with the help of an English language service or a native English speaker. The paper is very hard to read because of the standard of writing. There are misspellings, incorrect grammar, incorrect punctuation, informal or unclear language, and expressions that seem to imply false or contradictory information throughout the document.

2) The data source is incorrect. data.world.com just doesn't exist - it redirects me to world.com, which doesn't seem to hold any data. Update: now you need a specific source.

3) There are significant structuring problems with the paper. The introduction repeats a sentence from the abstract. "Nara Kim and Jang Mook Kang (2018) analyzed block chaining technology and digital authentication technology." This sentence belongs in the literature review. And the paper lacks a clear statement of methodology (in a methodology section) and then results (in a results section). It's fine to have dedicated sections that explain both methodology and present results, but then your paper introduction (and the first paragraph of each section) should try to explain what those sections are going to do.

4) The literature review goes into detail in several papers, but it is too deep, and not broad enough. Only 16 papers are cited in total. Such a paper should cite many more. Your specific focus seems to be cryptocurrencies during 2018-2022, so you should cite more recent papers that also study cryptocurrencies during this period. Most of your cited papers predate this. I've written two such papers you could cite: "Collective correlations, dynamics, and behavioural inconsistencies of the cryptocurrency market over time" (https://doi.org/10.1007/s11071-021-07166-9), "Changes to the extreme and erratic behaviour of cryptocurrencies during COVID-19" (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2020.125581). You

don't have to cite these in particular, but you should cite more recent papers that focus on cryptocurrency trends during 2018-2022.

5) I recommend you add more content to the paper. At the moment, you seem to be just documenting and commenting on price changes for individual cryptocurrencies. Perhaps you could compare them mathematically in a formal setting? Do they all go up during the same months? Do they all go down during the same months? There are many fruitful and interesting questions you could answer.