

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_100438
Title of the Manuscript:	BOOSTING INTERNALLY GENERATED REVENUE IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT: SIGNAGE AND ADVERTISEMENT REVENUE AS AN OPTION FOR CONSIDERATION.
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> <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. I have seen it as GOOD study findings and can contribute a lot. However, the study is not concrete or particular to an identified study area. It was very general, and it says Local Government. So, do all the Nigeria's Local Government not yet exploit the Signage and Advertising Revenues? The study was done as all local government did not access the benefit of the signage and advertising previously. This case should be clear, and others are very interesting on the case how the author addressed.</p> <p>YES suitable title, but little modification "BOOSTING INTERNAL REVENUE GENERATION IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT: WITH REFERENCE TO SIGNAGE AND ADVERTISING REVENUE AS AN OPTION"</p> <p>YES, good abstract. But some recommendations were not in the study findings, but approached as a recommendation in the abstract. I have showed it in the manuscript.</p> <p>YES, appropriate sections used</p> <p>Correct</p> <p>YES, all are sufficient. But, it was considered as the recent/updated reference if in the range of 5 years. The author has used references of the year 2017, 2018. Such references are not considered as recent. It will be better if replaced by the references from or after 2019 at all. We are 2023. The author should revise such issues with regarding to the old references that are seen throughout his/her paper.</p> <p>No another point I want to rise here, rather the author can get all the detailed comments inside the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Suitable, but some minor modifications should be required and better to revisit once again by the author. Those points are implied in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>No optional 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:	Benti Tafese Oljira
Department, University & Country	Bule Hora University, Ethiopia