

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_107943
Title of the Manuscript:	Debt Financing Composition and Operational Efficiency of Companies listed at Nairobi Stock Exchange, Kenya.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes. Partly.</p> <p>The title is good. Introduction: theoretical approach and results need a better explanation. The literature review should be extended to include rich, relevant studies on this topic. The methods are not described in sufficient detail to understand the approach used. The authors should include some additional and appropriate statistical tests. Interpretations: There is much improvement, and there needs to be a reasonable extension of the results. Conclusions: They need to be much improved. Policy implications? Limitations? The paper has a lot of grammatical mistakes and errors. The paper can benefit from language editing and proofreading.</p> <p>Results: The results do not fully describe the outcomes represented in the results table. The authors must motivate their discussion of the results with further empirical support and align their results with the existing theories described earlier in the study.</p> <p>The study is redundant in many places and appears to be unnecessarily long. The authors might try to reduce the length of their study by removing redundancies while keeping the organization intact. There are some spelling mistakes across the text, along with minor grammatical mistakes. The authors also appear to use slang, which should be carefully reviewed for consistency with the academic style of writing. The other independent variables should be related to the other variables in the study. Thus, lending rates for the economic sector should be used as explanatory variables. As it stands, this manuscript cannot be accepted for publication in the current journal until the authors complete all the required comments.</p> <p>The data and method section is not clearly presented. In order to be replicated by other authors in their future research and to be very easy to understand by the readers, I recommend the authors present the main steps of the research methodology. This presentation must be accomplished only from a theoretical point of view, with no other interference. The manuscript is relatively poorly structured and not easy to follow. There are some issues with this paper that need to be addressed. The research questions are missing, which negatively influences the clarity of the purpose of the research.</p> <p>2. Yes. 3. No. must be written. 4. No. 5. Yes. Partly. 6. Yes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>A professional English-language proofreader is advised before resubmission. The introduction section is poorly written and needs more clarifications and explanations. The writing style: for example, some paragraphs are just three sentences and others are too long. Please make your writing consistent.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	Nemer Badwan
Department, University & Country	College of Graduate Studies, Palestine Technical University – Kadoorie (PTUK), State of Palestine