

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_101480
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP ON FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE OF DEPOSIT TAKING SACCOS IN MERU COUNTY.
Type of the 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The article shows a good research work on the effects of leadership on financial performance of deposit taking saccos in Meru county. However, the literature review is not very comprehensive, and the regression results should be supplemented with summary statistics, Durbin Watson statistic, chi-square statistic etc to make results more robust and acceptable in the research.</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>The structure and the subsections of the manuscript can be worked upon to improve it. The section of literature review is very abstract. It becomes confusing for the reader now, so improvement in the structure of the paper is recommended.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>References are less and the research work should be supplemented with more recent references. Emphasis should be made on citing recent work more.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sakshi Aggarwal
Department, University & Country	Indian Institute of Foreign Trade, India