

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_126466
Title of the Manuscript:	The Moderating Effect of Self-Control on the Relationship Between Financial Knowledge and Retirement Planning Among Commercial Bank Employees in Eldoret Town, Kenya
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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 is scientifically designed, and it has contributed to the knowledge	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is correctly written and suitable.	
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.	The abstract need to be reframe as follows: i. Purpose ii. Design/methodology/approach iii. Findings iv. Research limitations/Implications v. Originality/value vi. Keywords: (5)	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes they are appropriately written but: i. One theory is ok for the study unless otherwise. ii. Research Methodology heading is not numbered	
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 content of the paper is ok. Relationship between the variables are well stated and Moderation clearly shown	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The Methodology section needs some amendment: 1. Explain the sampling frame before the sample size 2. Variable Measurement need to be shown 3. Method of data analysis need to be shown 4. Sources of questionnaire (adapted or adopted) need to be explain	

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:	Sani Dauda
Department, University & Country	Kaduna Polytechnic Kaduna, Nigeria