



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_19793
Title of the Manuscript:	Twenty Years of Implementation of District Assemblies' Common Fund in Ghana - (1994-2013) An Assessment of Disbursement
Type of the 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	Serious problems with acronyms: The author assumes that all readers would Ghanaians who must those acronyms: For example, what is MMDA? Line 42. It must be spelt out first. See lines 23/24, 41, 54 etc. Rephrase lines 14-16: Not clear. More confusing is line 69, the date presented here (1994-2009) is different from the title (1994-2013). Which is which? Line 63: Twenty-five what? Not clear. Why cite the same author twice Lines 114-115.	The acronyms are well spelt out. The date anomaly is also rectified. The Authors in line 114 and 115 is now cited once.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript MUST be revised and edited for minor grammatical mistakes: for example line 98: "data collected was" should read "were." There is confusion in the use of acronyms. The author must know that once an acronym is introduced there is no need to go back and spell the word out again. Some phrases are not clear and confusing: See lines 63, 118-120, 315-318, 841, 851 etc. The conclusion is weak and does not reflect the content of the manuscript. Include the methods and the analysis in the conclusion. The theory section was very weak. The author just presented strings of quotations from other publication without stating what theory this paper is using. Similarly, the methods section was not clear: I am not sure which hypotheses were tested in this paper. It is better to use the same period for the two parties: that is from 1994-2000 (NDC) and 2001-2008 (NPP). Lines 296-299: Give exact years of the distribution. 315-318 poorly written. Line 274: Delete "the " in front of Article	The manuscript has been subjected to proof reading. I have strengthened the conclusion as well as re-written the theoretical component as well as the poor component of introduction of the political parties.