

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is beneficial to the scientific community as it explores the relationship between a knowledge-based economy, accountability, and economic growth. This research is particularly relevant for policymakers and economists seeking to redesign effective strategies for economic growth.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is suitable</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is just okay in terms of its comprehensiveness. However, it contains typos, issues in language and improper use of a statistical term ("Partial Least Squares" not "Partial Least Square").</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Only subsections are appropriate but not the structure.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The methodology section has been poorly written. The equations underlying the PLS approach have been poorly written, not well defined, and no citation.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are not sufficient but recent.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I don't think the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication. Most of the sentences in the manuscript were poorly phrased which makes me believe that either the authors did not spend enough time to review the manuscript before submission or it's just that they need a native English speaker to review the manuscript for them. Inconsistencies in the placement of period especially around intext citations. Poorly structured manuscript, some of the tables are placed above the narratives (see Table 1). It is inappropriate to use a number to start a sentence or a table header (see Table 1) I generally think although the topic is timely, but the authors did not spend time to thoroughly review the manuscript.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

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:	Emmanuel Thompson
Department, University & Country	Southeast Missouri State University, USA