



REVIEWER REPORT

Manuscript Title:	A Probability-Driven Decision Support Tool for Forex Trading: A Binomial Distribution Analysis of Winning Trades and Profit Outcomes
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

EDITOR

Comments and Recommendations

Follow the suggestions of the reviewers and submit a response form that outlines any changes made in the manuscript following the suggestions. Ensure that each reference is legitimate and that the DOI is valid.

REVIEWER 1

Specific Comments and Recommendations

1. The abstract is well-structured but lacks concrete quantitative findings. While it mentions that findings demonstrate improved outcome predictability, it should include the actual effect sizes, sample size ($n=214$), or variance explained to ground the claims empirically.
2. The framework links the tool to profit outcomes, but the literature review does not adequately address the limitations of measuring financial performance via surveys. The authors need to review literature on self-reported financial performance and justify why this method was chosen over backtesting algorithmic data.
3. The authors state they use a quantitative explanatory research design combined with performance-related indicators reported by institutional forex practitioners. They must clarify exactly how profit outcomes are operationalized. Did they ask traders for their actual ROI percentages, or just a Likert rating of "My profits improved"? The authors also state they measure the tool through items like probability estimation clarity, ease of interpretation. This confirms the paper is measuring user acceptance/perception of a tool, not the mathematical efficacy of the binomial model itself. The manuscript needs to explicitly state this limitation.
4. Table 4 reports the beta, t-value, and p-value for the regressions. It crucially omits the R-squared or adjusted R-squared values. Without knowing the variance explained by the model, the reader cannot determine the practical significance of these variables. The correlations in Table 3 also are quite high across the board. While discriminant validity is claimed, the authors should discuss the potential for common method bias, as all data was gathered from a single survey instrument at a single point in time.
5. The authors conclude that probability-informed decision-making contributes to more stable and predictable trading results. They must temper this language. The data only supports that institutional traders believe or report that these tools stabilize their results.



6. A rigorous scientific paper must have a dedicated limitations section. The authors must acknowledge common method bias, the subjective nature of self-reported profit outcomes, and the inability to prove causality.

General Comments and Recommendations

The authors aim to evaluate how a probability-driven tool influences profit outcomes. However, the methodology relies entirely on cross-sectional survey data using five-point Likert scales to measure self-reported profit outcomes. Measuring financial profitability through subjective self-reporting introduces massive survivorship and self-serving biases. It is also unclear if the authors actually built a software tool and had the 214 respondents use it, or if they merely surveyed respondents about their general use of binomial-like frameworks in their daily jobs. If it is the latter, the study is evaluating an abstract concept rather than a specific decision support tool. Also, the paper uses causal language (e.g., "significantly improves the assessment" , "significantly enhanced") based on a cross-sectional survey. Cross-sectional designs can only establish correlation, not causation.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

REVIEWER 2

Specific Comments and Recommendations

The use of self-reported data for profit outcomes is a big concern. It might inflate positive effects since respondents could overstate benefits of the tool. To improve, suggest in revisions adding some objective metrics or triangulation with institutional reports or at least run sensitivity checks for bias. Also, in lit review and discussion, too many cites to Flores papers. This weakens objectivity. Expand with more diverse, peer-reviewed sources on binomial in finance to balance it. Finally, purposive sampling targets experts but with only Philippine institutions, claims about institutional forex trading broadly might overreach. Add a section on limitations and suggest future studies with wider samples like ASEAN comparison.

Abstract:

Good overview of the study, covers the problem, methods, and findings well. Keywords are relevant. It mentions "primary data were collected from..." but doesn't say how many or the sample size.

Introduction:



This section sets up the problem nicely, with global and Philippine context. The research questions are detailed and logical. I like how it ties into emerging markets. But it's a little heavy on listing roles like "Chief Investment Officers" repeatedly. Maybe consolidate to avoid repetition. The main research question is clear, but the sub-questions (there are seven) overlap some; perhaps group them into fewer for focus.

Literature Review:

Solid coverage of forex markets, quantitative approaches, and binomial models. It synthesizes well and points out gaps. Diversify with more independent sources to strengthen credibility.

Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses:

Hypotheses are well-developed from theory, but Hb and Hc could be more specific on how moderators work (e.g., does experience make the tool better or worse in certain cases?).

Methodology:

Quantitative design fits, and targeting institutional pros in the Philippines is good. But purposive sampling with $n=214$ is okay, but not random, so generalizability to all Philippine institutions might be limited. Mention this as a limitation. Also, relying on self-reported profit outcomes (Likert scales) could have bias; objective data like actual trade records would be stronger, but I understand confidentiality issues.

Results:

Tables are clear and support the claims. Stats look rigorous with reliability tests and regressions. Correlations and betas make sense. But in Table 6, the interaction for institutional role isn't shown. Did you test all moderators listed in Hc?

Discussion:

Links results back to theory well, explains implications. Good on how probability reduces bias. But it could discuss more on why Philippine context matters uniquely such as BSP regulations' impact.

Conclusion and Recommendations:

Wraps up strongly, with practical tips for institutions and regulators. Recommendations are actionable.

References:

List is comprehensive, with DOIs where needed. But some dates are 2025/2026 since submission is in 2026, check if these are published or in press; if not, cite as forthcoming. Also, a few like "Kim et al., 2024" lack full details (no DOI or journal).

General Comments and Recommendations

I think this paper has good potential for the journal because it brings together probability math with real-world finance in the Philippines context, which fits the focus on transformative research. The topic is timely with forex trading and institutional decisions and it tries to fill a gap in using binomial models for trading tools. But the paper needs some work to make it stronger. It's a bit repetitive in places and the methods could be more rigorous. I recommend minor



revisions before acceptance. The writing is clear mostly but sometimes too wordy and there are spots where ideas could be tighter.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			