



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	RESEARCH

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	<p>I think that the idea of the paper is valuable. However, there is something that does not fully convince me. First of all, I found the paper a little bit confused in its development. The research questions are too wide, and make the paper too demanding. These cause problems of internal coherence. I would just focus on the first three questions rewriting them a bit.</p> <p>A good literature review has been done, however I suggest to contextualize this work in the light of New Public Management reform.</p> <p>I do not find the regime analysis relevant for the aims of the paper. Also, it is based on strong hypothesis that are not made explicit, therefore the conclusion drawn by the author cannot be considered acceptable. I suggest to delete this paragraph and focus on the qualitative analysis only.</p> <p>The research methodology mentions interviews and questionnaires. However it is not clear how these contribute to the data collection. Are these interviews structured, unstructured or semi-structured? If there is a structured component I would appreciate to have it attached in the appendix. Same reasoning for the questionnaires: which kind of questions or items were these displaying? What was the answering rate? I think the author should spend more time on explaining the methodology.</p> <p>For what concerns the theoretical framework, as I already pointed out, there should be a link to the NPM</p>	<p>The research questions have been reduced to three as suggested.</p> <p>The regime analysis is critical to the study because in Ghana every public policy is measured with political party orientation. Also focusing on qualitative information will kill the data collected through questionnaire.</p> <p>The interviews were structured with defined questions for each category of respondents.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	reform implementation in Ghana.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I noticed some English mistakes. I suggest extensive proofreading. Table 1 should display the year.	I have submitted the manuscript to proof reading. The date for table 1 is hereby displayed in the work- 2003.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		