

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_108327
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF FIRM SIZE ON SHORT TERM DEBT OF FIRMS LISTED ON THE NAIROBI SECURITIES EXCHANGE, KENYA
Type of the Article	Research Article

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>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>Yes, of course because the major advantage of a peer review process is that peer-reviewed article provides a trusted form of scientific community.</p> <p>The researcher has chosen catchy title in this review. The title of this review could able to understand by the young researcher.</p> <p>Yes, the present abstract of the article comprehensive to the related research.</p> <p>No, The researcher has failed to show answer in this part (Literature review and Theoretical review). Better try to add some information or remove this heading. Both headings are hanging without represent anything.</p> <p>Perhaps, this research paper scientifically correct.</p> <p>Present paper shows 19 reference and all references are under criteria. If the researcher added more references it would be more advantages.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, the researcher has used enough English quality for scholarly communication as well.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Title: Title of this research paper consists of 17 words. The suitable title length depends on whether target journal favours indicative or informative title. In general journals favouring short indicative titles for example prefer titles with less than eight words. Researcher used normal within the limit (say about 10-15 max). Hence, the topic has chosen by researcher based on the research area.</p> <p>Abstract: The researcher described the purpose of the resesarch, methodology, key findings and practice implications as well inside the abstract. The abstract may also be the only part of research paper that has a word limit. Present research paper shows totally 187 words and within the criteria. However, in general, it is best to avoid using abbreviations and acronyms in the abstract unless the abbreviation / acronym is commonly understood and /or is used multiple times in the abstract.</p> <p>Keywords: Keywords are words or phrases that you feel capture the most important aspects of the research paper. The publication manual does not place a limit on how many key words may use. However, to be most effective, keywords should be a concise summary of the research paper's content. Recommended keywords are three to five. Hence, in this article researchers quoted four keywords.</p> <p>Introduction: Generally, an introduction justifies the significance of the subject matter and connects work to previous research. It is sensible to write the introduction in a form of a logical funnel. A logical funnel is a practical way to build up a functioning introduction. The author has used in-text citation as well and focuses on recent periods 2016, 2017,2018 and 2019. The purpose of the article is not expressed last in the introduction by describing the research problem. The aim of</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>the article to motivate the reader and help them to understand the research topic is more important.</p> <p>Literature Review: The researcher has failed to show answer in this part. Better try to add some information or remove this heading. This part also nothing to show anything. The researcher has focused agency theory which is relating to the present article.</p> <p>Methodology: The article must describe research, the set-up and research methods precisely. In this way the reviewers can assess the scientific basis of research and justification of results. In this present article, researcher focuses on secondary data collection, population and data analysis.</p> <p>Results & Discussion: The analysis section of an article must concentrate on the actual analysis of the material, not on documenting the data. In the results section to explained and contemplated the results as well. The researcher has analysed with the help of statistical support. The key results of the results highlights by the researcher using through visual elements such as tables.</p> <p>Conclusion: The conclusion section, alongside the abstract and introduction, is one of the core elements of a journal article. Moreover, the conclusion section can be written up by using introduction, results, significance of the research/practical implications, limitations and recommended topic for further study. Hence, in this present article the researcher mentioned just conclusion of the empirical results of this study and implications as well. researchers.</p> <p>References: Generally, experimental, quasi-experimental and analytical design typically has between 35 and 39 references. Present paper shows 19 reference and all references are under criteria.</p>	
--	---	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. S. Jeyaraj
Department, University & Country	Gxun Business School, Sino-British College, Staffordshire University, UK, Guangxi Minzu University, China