

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_91193
Title of the Manuscript:	AUDIT COMMITTEES' EFFECTIVENESS IN TANZANIA: THE CASE OF SELECTED PUBLIC AUTHORITIES IN TANZANIA
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:

<https://www.journalajebe.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>

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	<p>Table 1 refers to "household head". Why is this terminology being used, when the sample is referring to audit committees rather than households?</p> <p>The dependent variable AC effectiveness should be further discussed. How was it measured? If respondents were asked to decide whether a committee is effective or otherwise, were they given any guidelines regarding how to arrive at this inference? The dependent variable effectiveness is measured as a binary variable. However, one would presume that audit committees may have various levels of effectiveness and therefore such binary approach may prove to be too simplistic. These factors ought to be amended or at least discussed in detail.</p> <p>The variables EDULEV and Expertise in Table 1, could overlap. Apart from the fact that this relates to the fact that there is no specific definition of expertise, it could lead to multicollinearity in the estimated models. The fact that these two variables prove statistically insignificant in the model, reinforces this conjecture that there could be a potential for multicollinearity. Why not devise a way to combine these two variables into one?</p> <p>What are the limitations of the study? For instance, how was "independence" of the committee member defined? Could it be that some members claim that they are independent, when in fact they are not?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The eight public authorities selected for the study are listed twice in both sections 2.1 and 2.3. This is unnecessary repetition.</p> <p>In discussing the results for gender, the authors report that "male workers are less likely to apply the auditing ethical standards than their female counterparts". How did this self-administered questionnaire lead to such inference? Did respondents specifically state that they / their colleagues applied / failed to apply the ethical standards?</p> <p>In my opinion the result may indicate that the predominance of one particular gender may lead to less / more effectiveness, but not whether ethical standards are being applied. Again, this issue is related to the idea that the dependent variable – effectiveness – was not defined clearly.</p> <p>In the same paragraph, the authors mention that "women apply stricter ethical standards than men, give more importance to their monitoring role, and tend to be less tolerant of opportunistic behaviour". The authors should support this observation by referring to a prior study.</p> <p>In the conclusion, the authors report that "Our findings revealed that effective performance of audit committee is principally influenced by the age of the respondent, gender, independence, the number of audit committee members, audit committee expertise and the number of audit committee meetings." Why is expertise being granted the same importance as the other mentioned variables, when in fact it proved statistically insignificant?</p> <p>Similarly, the conclusion states: "review and monitoring of internal controls system, risk management and affiliations between internal and external auditors add values to the adequate performance of audit committees. Also, review of financial reports and visibility of activities increase financial accountability hence leading to effectiveness of audit committee." Relying on what was reported in the manuscript, the authors did not delve into such factors... eg. Risk management, financial reports, internal controls.</p> <p>Therefore they should not claim the effectiveness of ACs is dependent on these variables when they did not actually consider them. At best, these aspects should be mentioned as a limitation / avenue for future research, in the sense that subsequent research may focus more specifically on such areas which seem to have been sidelined in this study.</p> <p>The paper should be proof-read for grammatical / syntax mistakes.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Silvio John Camilleri
Department, University & Country	University of Malta, Malta