

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The article is more relevant to the particular region.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is.</p> <p>3. Yes, it is.</p> <p>4. The structure of the article and the division of subsections follow the methodology of scientific writing.</p> <p>5. Partially. Researchers have chosen different models to test. I would suggest going deep in the study, not wide. I would like to see a deeper analysis, and a more extended discussion. The researchers state the <b>broad objective</b> of the study. Are there any other objectives for this study?</p> <p>6. There is no consistency in the use of references. Sometimes the references are in alphabetical order e.g. (Akpan, 2005; Romer, 1996), sometimes by year of publication e.g. (Hausman, 1978; Baum, 2006). The article should certainly be supplemented with references to recent research, e.g. <i>Many development theories ...</i> is mentioned in the <b>introduction</b>, but no reference is made. Or in <b>literature review</b> <i>A significant number of empirical studies (Akpan, 2005; Romer, 1996) have been carried out on the relationship between spending... (a significant number,</i> but only 2 literature references mentioned). <b>When referring to a source, please indicate the first-hand source!</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, it is.</p> <p>Some grammatical mistakes were noticed.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is advisable not only to refer to and quote other researchers, but also to express your own views. Which theory/model do you support.</li> <li>It would be desirable to set out a hypothesis.</li> <li>The conclusions are so general that they are essentially axioms that have long since ceased to need proving.</li> </ul>	

### 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:	Sandra Iriste
Department, University & Country	Latvia University of Life Sciences and Technologies, Latvia