

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_85050
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF REVENUE COLLECTION ON ECONOMIC GROWTH IN ZANZIBAR
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:

(<https://www.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy>)

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	MY observations: 1. Serious typo errors. 2. Interpretation of the result must be in percentage and not in unit since the variables were converted to log. 3. The finding of the study should be link to theory and then buttress by empirical findings 4. How did the athor(s) determines the method used? I cannot find the result of the unit root test. Note that wrong choice of method could lead to spurious regression which is a serious issue in the research world as this may lead to a misleading policy guide for the study area. 5. The language of the work must be consistence. If the researcher is using past tense or present tense, please stick to it throughout the study. 6. The abstract reported that the study adopted both VECM and causality test, yet I cannot find the result of the causality test in the body of the work; this is a technical issue in research world which must be handle with care in other not to jeopardize the reputation of this reputable journal. 7. In general, this work need a general reform.	 1. Typing error has been corrected 2. The resulted converted into % 3. The finding of the study have been linked to theory 4. All other comments have been revised accordingly in the revised manuscript
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	