



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
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 (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	- You need to better show the research question and importance. - You need to rewrite the theoretical framework using your own words, and in a more uniform manner (especially the discussion of the four models) - You need to illustrate the situation in Kenya as a setting for the study, and why the continuous auditing would be a solution to any existing problems. - You need to briefly list some earlier studies from Kenya and elsewhere, and integrate them in the theoretical framework. - You need to give more detail on the research method and its contents, and how it was designed and administered. Also give more detail about the study population and sample selection. - You need to show detailed findings of the questionnaire (not just the very simple tables 2 and 3). We need to see the questions and their results. - You need to comment more on the findings and their implications and likely reasons. - The conclusion should show us more clearly what you have added and what implications your findings have in practice.	1. The research questions and their importance have been added in the intro 2. Sections 2.3 on CA models has be revised 3. Added the following Kenya studies: (Chelimo and Kariuki, 2013) and (Okibo and Kamau, 2012) 4. Section 2.2 on acceptance of CA has been added to justify the importance of study 5. Section 3 on Research Method has been revised 6. Section 4 on Results and Discussion has been revised to give more details 7. Conclusions have been reviewed



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- You need some revision of English language - You need better referencing (some references are missing or not well referenced)	- A review of language has been done - References have been revised
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		