

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_100463
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF ACCOUNTABILITY ON PUBLIC POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN MARSBIT COUNTY GOVERNMENT.
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.journalajebo.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><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 study can help raise awareness of the issue in the scientific community by recommending that county government have effective mechanisms in place to hold public sector bodies to citizens and other stakeholders to be accountable and accountable for their policies, decisions and actions, especially in relation to public finances.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable</p> <p>3. The article abstract is complete</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. The references, even if sufficient, could be integrated with some more recent references.</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>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for academic communication</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>the study could be broadened by making a comparison with the international context, with government structures similar to the case examined in the project</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Elena Cristiano</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Calabria, Italy</b>