

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_98857
Title of the Manuscript:	DESIGN THINKING AND INNOVATION IN THE INFORMAL INDUSTRIES IN KENYA
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> )

## 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 Manuscript has highlighted some important issues that can benefit researchers, industry players in Kenya, its government agencies, and publics, either from scientific perspective or as an additional knowledge and learning about the contextual scope of the industry in Afrika.</p> <p>2. The title can be retained or improved further.</p> <p>3. The abstract – It is better to add a bit more explanations of the methodology of the study and add the implications of the study to the industry and country. Avoid repetitive and redundant statements.</p> <p>4. The structure and subsection are in in order. However, Literature review can be more comprehensive to show how the authors derived the conceptual framework.</p> <p>And the explanation of the <b>Research Methodology</b> is too brief for readers to understand how the process of the identification and evaluation of data set were done – so more explanations are required on how the factors (categories) in Table 1,2,3,4 was selected. You may use a process flow chart or graph for ease of understanding. You may exhibit how the categories or themes are emerged.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct but required some more explanations (as mentioned above) to enrich the contributions of the study and to allow readers to understand how this study was conducted using the selected analysis.</p> <p>6. Referencing format must be improved, both intext citations, and reference lists.</p> <p>7. <b>Other comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Refine the writing style – on page 2 for instance, must capitalise the first word of a sentence.</li> <li>- Do not use" is n't, don't etc on a paper i.e., on page 6.</li> <li>- Avoid repetitive statements.</li> </ul>	
<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 English is acceptable for authors from a country where English is the second language, but the content needs to be refined since some minor flaws detected. And the English accuracy must be checked again before the final submission.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The paper has shed some new insights about the Kenya's informal industry. So, it can appeal many readers to read it. However, more information is missing especially on the methodology and findings of the study.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Filzah Md Isa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Taylor's University, Malaysia</b>