

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_125526
Title of the Manuscript:	A comparative analysis of Accounting Ethics Between Private and Public Organizations: A Case Study of Morogoro Municipality
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>Addressing a major issue in the area, the study provides a current and pertinent comparative examination of accounting ethics between public and private enterprises in Morogoro Municipality. It uses a descriptive study design, which works well for examining attitudes and behaviors around accounting ethics. A thorough statistical comparison of ethical behaviors across industries is made possible by applying quantitative techniques, such as t-tests, which yield insightful results. Furthermore, the study's emphasis on fundamental ethical concepts like objectivity, honesty, and confidentiality shows a thorough awareness of the ethical environment in accounting.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>"A Comparative Analysis of Accounting Ethics Between Private and Public Organizations: A Case Study of Morogoro Municipality," is an appropriate title for the article. It effectively communicates the research's primary goal: to compare accounting ethics in two organizational contexts: the public and private sectors.</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 should highlight any noteworthy distinctions in the ethical standards of public and private companies, as well as the study's primary conclusions. The contributions of the study would become more apparent to readers as a result. Despite mentioning a descriptive research design and a sample size of 176 respondents, the abstract may provide a brief description of the data collection method (such as questionnaires) and the statistical techniques utilized for analysis (such as t-tests). This would help readers understand how the study was carried out. The abstract would be improved by including a phrase discussing the study's practical implications or suggestions based on the results</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript's structure and subsections seem acceptable for the subject matter. Here are some important details about the company: The logical flow Beginning with an introduction outlining the context and goals of the research, the paper proceeds logically. A thorough methodology section follows, which is crucial to comprehending how the study was carried out.</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 manuscript's rigorous methodological approach and adequate statistical analyses reveal scientific soundness and robustness. The study successfully examines the ethical practices of public and private firms by using ANOVA models and t-tests, guaranteeing that the results are dependable and statistically valid. Furthermore, the results are more credible due to the research design, which uses validated scales for data collecting and a well-defined sample size. The manuscript's technical validity is further reinforced by the extensive discussion of findings in connection to previous research, which offers a strong basis for the conclusions and suggestions offered.</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 manuscript's sources seem to include both more recent research and traditional foundational works, which is advantageous for offering both historical background and up-to-date perspectives on accounting ethics. Nonetheless, it would be helpful to include more recent studies or publications published in the previous several years that expressly address accounting ethics, especially in the context of private and public enterprises, even though some of the references are from 2023. Take into account citing papers from respectable publications such as the Journal of Business Ethics, Accounting Ethics, or International Journal of Accounting that focus on ethical issues in accounting and finance.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article's English and vocabulary seem to be generally appropriate for academic communication. Here are some observations about its appropriateness:</p> <p>The manuscript's use of precise and unambiguous language is crucial for properly communicating intricate concepts and study findings. A thorough comprehension of the topic is evident in the right usage of the terminology pertaining to accounting ethics. As befits scholarly works, the text retains a formal academic tone. This tone contributes to the presentation of the research's professionalism and credibility.</p> <p>The sentences are coherent and well-organized, which facilitates understanding. The use of headings and subsections improves readability even further by making it easier for readers to follow the argument.</p> <p>Although the work is of good quality overall, there might be a few small typographical or grammatical problems that could be fixed to make it even better. Any such problems might be removed and the text's overall polish improved with a comprehensive proofreading procedure</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Roopa Johri
Department, University & Country	University of Delhi, India