

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_96121
Title of the Manuscript:	The link between human capital and economic growth in East Africa
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.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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>YES. The manuscript analyses and investigates the role of human capital as a factor in stimulating output growth in East Africa. The findings indeed showed that human capital investment was positive and significant to economic growth in East Africa. Moreover, policies and strategies presented which advocate for accelerated public investment in human capital development will promote productivity growth and further stimulate resilient economic growth in the East African economies.</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES, but it would be better if a separate chapter for detailed explanation of the findings should be inserted exactly before the Conclusions</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Almost excellent paper and presentation. Very good structure (scoping review, discussion) with a direct reference to the literature, although it would be better if a separate chapter for detailed explanation of the findings should be inserted exactly before the Conclusions. Good argumentation of the data and the tests from the model analysis and findings. A more detailed analysis at the new separate chapter with remarks might be presented regarding the results from the model and their interpretation (a smooth connection from the model math findings to policy suggestions).</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:	Athanasios Panagopoulos
Department, University & Country	University of Macedonia, Greece