

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_123269
Title of the Manuscript:	Public debt sustainability: An empirical analysis on Kenya
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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 present paper presents a well-structured scientific study with analytical value not only for the analysis of indebtedness in Kenya but also for the study of debt parameters in general. The manuscript is stylistically robust and presents the discussed issues in an optimal volume.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is apt.	
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.	In the summary, it would be good to mark the key parameters of the research, such as object, subject, purpose of the research, research thesis, tasks that are aimed to be achieved with the development, as well as methodology by which the research will be carried out. Thus, the most important parts of the development will be highlighted in the summary.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The development has a classic structure, meeting the requirements for stability and sustainability of the development.	
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 development is scientifically supported with well-defined scientific parameters. This represents the competence of the author(s) on the subject. The larger number of observations would give a significantly more accurate assessment of the persistence and specific dimensions of the indicators, for example by month. The methodology and the subsequent approval are correctly displayed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. The scope of the literature used could be expanded with European sources examining debt sustainability in a more abstract way.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are minor technical errors that should be fixed.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Silvia Zarkova
Department, University & Country	Dimitar A. Tsenov Academy of Economics, Bulgaria