

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA _115898
Title of the Manuscript:	Government expenditure and economic growth: does corruption and democracy matter?
Type of the Article	Literature Research

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses a crucial issue regarding the relationship between government expenditure, corruption, democracy, and economic growth. By analyzing data from Kenya over a substantial period, it provides insights into the complexities of this relationship and offers valuable implications for policymakers and researchers interested in understanding how governance factors influence economic outcomes.</p> <p>2. The title of the article, "Government Expenditure and Economic Growth: Does Corruption and Democracy Matter?" is suitable as it accurately reflects the main focus of the manuscript and highlights the key variables under investigation.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive as it succinctly summarizes the research objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. It effectively conveys the main points of the study, allowing readers to understand the scope and significance of the research.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate. The manuscript is well-organized, with clear delineation of sections such as Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion. This structure facilitates readability and comprehension of the research findings.</p> <p>5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, as it employs established methodologies such as the Generalized Method of Moments (GMM) for estimation and incorporates relevant theoretical frameworks and empirical literature to support its arguments. However, a thorough peer review process would be necessary to ensure the validity and robustness of the findings.</p> <p>6. The references provided are sufficient and include a mix of theoretical and empirical studies relevant to the topic. However, to enhance the comprehensiveness of the literature review, additional recent references could be considered, particularly those that offer alternative perspectives or recent developments in the field. For example, recent studies on the impact of government expenditure on economic growth in other countries or regions could provide valuable comparative insights.</p>	<p>Well noted</p> <p>A number of tests like Hansen and Jacque Berra have been introduced for robustness check.</p> <p>References has been updated using most recent studies namely published 2024.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The excessive use of passive narration can diminish readability and reader engagement. Passive narration tends to make sentences less direct and dynamic. Conversely, active narration can aid in clarifying the subject and object in a sentence, as well as enhancing the clarity and coherence of the conveyed message.</p>	<p>edited</p>

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	After reviewing the article, several criticisms can be made. Firstly, while the abstract presents the research objectives clearly, the introduction could strengthen the articulation of the research hypothesis. Providing a clearer presentation of the research hypothesis would assist readers in better understanding the study's aims. Secondly, there is insufficient information regarding data limitations and methodology. It is important to clearly communicate the research's limitations and potential biases to enable readers to evaluate the reliability of the findings. Thirdly, although the article mentions the use of the Generalized Method of Moments (GMM) for estimation, there is inadequate detail about the model specification and goodness-of-fit tests. More detailed information about the statistical analysis process would enhance readers' confidence in the findings. Fourthly, while the conclusion covers the main research findings, it would be beneficial to include more specific policy recommendations and practical implications for policymakers and practitioners in the field. Lastly, some references included in the article appear to be hypothetical. It would be preferable to replace them with real and relevant references to support the presented arguments effectively. By addressing these aspects, the article can become stronger scientifically and make a more significant contribution to the research community.	Noted A number of tests have been introduced Study limitation has been provided Reference updated
---------------------------	---	--

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	