

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_86924
Title of the Manuscript:	WORKING CAPITAL MANAGEMENT CYCLE AND PROFITABILITY OF RETAIL SUPERMARKETS IN MOMBASA, KENYA: A CASE STUDY OF BINATHMAN HOUSEHOLD SUPERMARKET IN MOMBASA CITY.
Type of the Article	Case study

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data collection instruments were not indicated - In your model specification, what is α? And what the error term represent? - Similarly, the assumption of the OLS model are missed such as multicollinearity, autocorrelation, heteroscedasticity and normality <p>Result and Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the descriptive analysis, from 4.2.1 to 4.2.4, the analysis or the discussion is incorrect particularly, your conclusion. In these section, you presented only the mean and standard deviation of the variables. However, you try to associate the result with profitability without using correlation or regression analysis. Thus, you have to discuss as it is than linking with profitability. I recommend to rewrite this part. - While using mean score you have to put an assumption about the mean. For example, if computed mean = 2.4? What does it indicate? - In the correlation and regression model, there is no an indication that profitability is cross-sectional or time series data? If it is cross-sectional data, it is okay. But, if it is time series data, as per my knowledge and econometrics literatures, we cannot make analysis for two different data type. In the interpretation table should be referenced. - On section 4.4, table 8, the reported unadjusted R Squared 0.518 but you interpreted as 66% how it could be? It should be 51.8%. As a researcher, always we have to use the R-Square for interpretation of the goodness of fit of the model. Why use unadjusted R-Square? - Discussion of the regression result is shallow and not supported with literatures. In addition, the interpretation is not correct. The researcher/s should introduce citrus paribus assumption along with mean composite interpretation. <p>Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Derived from the results...so it should be modified as per the findings 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Specific comments on the Manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better if you modified as "The Effect of Working Capital Management cycle on Profitability of-----". Your title is appropriate if you undertake bi-directional casual research. - At abstract, only general objective is indicated, so you can eliminate the specific objectives. - The abstract miss an important component of it, i.e. recommendations, so incorporate it. - In abstract, the use of uncommon abbreviation is not allowed in scientific study... for instance, WCM..... Write like this: Working Capital Management (WCM), then you can use the abbreviation in the whole document - Key words must be written alphabetically <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The first paragraph and first line: Working Capital (WCM)... You missed the word Management - You can merge statement of problem and objectives within the Introduction. In addition, please remove the definition of the variables from Introduction. This is to avoid redundancy because you have defined them at literature review section. - Follow inductive way of writing (begin from general and come to specific issue). - The contributions of the study either for theory or policy inputs are not indicated..... <p>Literature Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please reorganize it, first theoretical literature review and then empirical... <p>Materials and Method:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Before you embark on the materials and methods, first describe the study area even with the help of map, and other variables. Because, any reader who do not know the area know from your description - In the target population, only 75 these your study subject? If yes, the sample is small...so that our result could not be generalizable? It would be better if you increase the case areas - The Yamane (1967) formula is not indicated? You put the sample, but reader want to know the margin of error and so on. - Your sample = 63 and population = 75 are nearly equal, why not you use census? 	
Optional/General comments	<p>Focusing on an important issue, but lack the rigor to achieve the study objectives. Methodologically, the study is somehow flawed that require some corrections. As a result, the result is defective, hence the conclusion and recommendation is unsound. Thus, I recommend the researcher/s to rewrite the study and incorporate all the important things. As we know research is a written communication, so anybody can understand the notion of the study without communicating the author/s.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Endalkachew Kabtamu Mekonen
Department, University & Country	Wolkite University, Ethiopia