

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_103762
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Good Governance on Health Outcome, Among Selected African Countries
Type of the Article	Review

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.journalajebea.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>It is suitable but with amendment</p> <p>Title is too vague.</p> <p>Abstract is not clear on the method and results/findings</p> <p>They need to be reworked</p> <p>With some changes it can be correct</p> <p>Yes references are correct and not too old.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language is correct. However the title is too vague. It tells not which selected countries of Africa. This is also lacking in the introduction. In defining the concept Governance, the author has not given a clear definition aligned to how they are using it in the paper. The whole paper does not come clear on impact made by Good governance on health. It is suggested that the paper get some re-arrangement</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Be clear with the recommendations. As it stands the conclusion is not assisting in giving concrete impact of good governance in health.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bernard Naledzani Rasila
Department, University & Country	University of South Africa, South Africa