

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	Review Article

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 <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Topic The study topic of “working capital management cycle and profitability of retail supermarkets in Mombasa, Kenya: a case study of binathman household supermarket in Mombasa city” is good and current</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The topic is good and satisfactory <p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract is good and satisfactorily constructed. It has covered all the components of a good abstract. <p>RECOMMENDATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract provides a holistic overview of the study. However, the abstract is too long. It should be short and precise <p>Background</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The general background of the study is satisfactorily covered The problem addressed by the study is satisfactory <p>RECOMMENDATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The researcher should consider adding some statistics to strengthen the argument of the study. <p>Literature review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Theoretical review in the study is satisfactory The study's Empirical review is satisfactorily done. <p>Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study methodology is satisfactory. However, the study methodology is silent on the assumption of a regression model. <p>RECOMMENDATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarise the assumptions regression model tested in the diagnostics test and conclude if they hold or not. <p>RESULTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are satisfactory <p>Discussions and conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions should be based on the variables under the study as well as linked to the theories under review <p>Bibliography and citations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bibliography and citations are satisfactorily done. 	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	James Baariu Mungiria
Department, University & Country	Kenyatta University, Kenya