

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_110456
Title of the Manuscript:	FREE CASH FLOW AND SHORT-TERM DEBT OF FIRMS LISTED AT THE NAIROBI SECURITIES EXCHANGE KENYA
Type of the Article	Empirical 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript will benefit the scientific community if revised from its current form. 2. The title of the article is okay. 3. The abstract is deficient. The abstract should portray the study problem followed by its objective(s), underpinning theory(s) [optional], methodology – (data & data source, scope, and estimation technique), empirical findings, conclusion, and recommendations. 4. The author(s) are advised to follow the conventional APA style of Introduction, Literature (theoretical & empirical merged), Methodology, Results & discussion, and Conclusion & Recommendations. 5. The manuscript is not scientifically correct based on submitted empirical result. 6. The author(s) have not provided sufficient empirical evidence on the topic of discuss (only 4 empirical evidence was provided in the manuscript). The author(s) should consult/review recent and relevant literature. <p>Additional:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript introduction is flooded with definitions rather than adequate background of the research topic. The background should be written to provide extant link among the variables – general framework; portray the main gaps that need to be addressed – problem statement; establish the study significance; and conclusion. 2. The provided theoretical literature is too scanty with no highlights of how the theories contribute to the understanding of the identified research problem. The author(s) can also consider Free Cash Flow (FCF) hypothesis. 3. The author(s) empirical review is too shallow and lacks focus. Thus, the author(s) failed to establish gap in the literature. 4. The author(s) claimed under methodology section to have done descriptive and inferential statistics, but none was provided in the result section. Similarly, the author(s) stated Random Effect Model (REM) in the methodology section, but the Fixed Effect Model (FEM) result was presented in the result section. 5. The study time scope very outdated (2007-2011). 6. The result presented in Table 1 under results section does not represent true estimate of Fixed Effect Model (FEM). 7. The author(s) study model has just one independent variable and this will not capture real changes in explained variable. 8. The research has not been thoroughly done, thus no valid conclusion or recommendation drawn. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The article language use is suitable for scholarly communication as well as publication.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	The manuscript needs to be overhaul in its entirety.	
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	Bisiryu Sodiq Olaide
Department, University & Country	School of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, SRM University, India