



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_10123
Title of the Manuscript:	Embracing Continuous Auditing for Public Sector in Kenya
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Not substantial and impact enough to be considered as a journal. This article may appropriate as a proceedings. Major weaknesses: • Contributions not stated properly/not given • What is new? • Too little citations/references, indicate literature review not comprehensive enough • Section 2.1 cannot be understand • No literature or empirical evidence on all the models used • Reader unable to understand why this study is so important, apart for the particular country? • Two aims stated but seems the second aim was not achieved (missing in the write up) • Research method not robust, not structured, no reference with prior study • Results – only descriptive? Any other more scientific statistical analysis? It is recommended the author to affiliate or co-author with someone who got experience in publishing journal with impact factors.	a. Conclusions have been revised to show contribution b. Section 2.1 shows justification of this study c. Significant update of the literature has been done d. Section 2.1 on CA has been overhauled e. Section 2.3 about the models has been revised f. Section 2.1 shows why this study is need to taken/has been taken in several countries g. The aim has been revised h. Research Method Section 3 has been significantly revised i. Results Section 4.2 has been reviewed Guidance has been sought from colleagues
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Too many deficiencies.	The deficiencies have now been minimized