

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>
<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 study has an interesting premise. It analyses the determinants of debt sustainability in Kenya owing to its consistent budget deficits and higher debt servicing. The article talks about a crucial issue in Kenya that could undo macroeconomic progress if unchecked. However, I have certain recommendations which I believe would further enhance the article and make it more compelling:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "In spite of debt servicing consuming a large proportion of the country's resources it is argued that Kenya's debt is sustainable yet there is still a problem in meeting debt service payments evidenced by the recent rescheduling of public debts. This study is therefore an effort to explore the determinants of government debt sustainability in Kenya, focusing on macroeconomic indicators and fiscal policies". The motivation seems a bit incomplete and disoriented. Why is the argument that Kenya's debt is sustainable, relevant? You should rather explain the consequences of unchecked debt servicing payment failures. That should make the story seamless. 2. The background of the introduction is way too long and loses the plot here and there. Make it at least 50% briefer. You have mentioned your motivations (need proper explanations as mentioned in point 1), research questions towards the very end of the introduction while they should be placed much earlier. Readers should get a whiff of your entire article towards the very beginning. 3. You need to mention the estimation techniques, data type, period and other relevant details in the Introduction. 4. You also need to more clearly explain the research gap. 5. In the Conclusion section, you need to mention the shortcomings of your study, potential solutions and future research directions in this area of research. 6. The recommendations you provide, should be connected to your empirical findings. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes.</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 too long, rife with unnecessary information. I recommend making it shorter (150-200 words) including only the most important information on the article (like research question, methodology and findings) and in academic language.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes.</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>I have multiple recommendations here, though I like the use of GMM model.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please present descriptive statistics of the variables. 2. Please present the correlation matrix of the variables. 3. It is important to check for multicollinearity among the variables. Please present the VIF test results. 4. When the sample size is small (34 in your case), ARDL Bounds test model is one of the most effective and popular techniques. It also helps you determine the short- and long-run dynamics. Executing this model will add a layer of robustness check and enhance the study. For reference of the methodology, check, https://doi.org/10.1007/s43546-024-00685-8 (Income inequality in the face of climate change: an empirical investigation on unequal nations, vulnerable regions and India). 	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	I am satisfied with the references. The references are balanced with a mixture of recent to old (and established) articles.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The author(s) have overall maintained a good level of the language. However, the article can be shortened by removing excess words or shortening long sentences at various places. I also recommend availing online grammar checking services to increase the quality of the article. There are punctuation issues in many places that must be taken care of.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Though the paper is promising, it requires some serious revisions to enhance its quality and optimise its impact.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Swapnanil Sen Gupta
Department, University & Country	Goethe University, Graduate School of Economics, Finance and Management, India