

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_100076
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Shareholder Strategy – An Internal Corporate Social Responsibility Perspective on Organizational Commitment in Five-Star Hotels in Kenya
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><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 subject under study is relevant, current, appropriate to the title and this title verts entirely on the content analysed. The organisation of the text of the article is logical, with clear and linked ideas and, with adequate linguistics. However, the author's arguments should be more robust, and the acronyms used should be described first and only then used. There are spelling mistakes throughout the document that are shaded in yellow for better identification.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is well written, identifying the objective of the research, the methodology and the results. Eventually the author could have added a justification for the topic and identified more clearly the object of study.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes, because the article is based on a current and very important theme for debate and even more for research. It does not have a new approach either in the way of problematization and/or in the theoretical-methodological elements used.</p> <p>6. The citations and references are in accordance with the characteristics of a scientific article: recent, relevant, and well placed. The text presents an adequate number of 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>Yes.</p> <p>The manuscript meets the requirements for publication due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Being a current and relevant theme;</li> <li>• The need to debate the topic and therefore to go into it in greater depth;</li> <li>• The structure of the work is well organized;</li> <li>• The conclusions reflect the study carried out, even though they could be more robust.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	No	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Maria José da Silva Faria</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Lusíada University, Maia University, Portugal</b>