

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_121134
Title of the Manuscript:	THE INFLUENCE OF KNOWLEDGE-BASED ECONOMY AND ACCOUNTABILITY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript covers are very interesting area of knowledge based economy and accountability of 10 East and South Asian countries.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is appropriate.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Actionable theoretical and practical implications are missing from the abstract. Please include this vital aspect. Include a brief problem statement in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Overall it is fine. However, some formatting is needed in some sections. For example, in section 4.2, bullets are given without any subheadings. Please carefully check the formatting of each section.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript covers all the aspects of the research. In methodology, an explanation of the sources from where the measurement scales are adopted/adapted is required. The literature reviews should conclude with a critical paragraph highlighting the literature gap and the need to fill it. The discussion section needs improvement. The author has rewritten the findings and just listed the literature with the same or different results. Here, you are required to critically explain the logic of the findings with literature support. Merely writing that the results are similar or against some studies is not enough. Separate sections on limitations, future directions and implications of the study are required before the conclusion.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Update the literature and include the relevant studies from 2023 and 2024.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Overall the language is understandable. However, in a few cases, proofreading is needed. For example, in section 1.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	If possible, the author can check the robustness of the results by applying the Propensity Score Matching technique.	

Review Form 3

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:	Faisal Khan
Department, University & Country	City University Ajman, United Arab Emirates