



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_53090
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Procurement Practices on Service Delivery: A Case Study of VRA, Ghana
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 (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>Regarding compulsory revision, it is my opinion that the following suggestions would improve the quality of the paper for a further publication:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve the numbering, since for example 5. Contribution of the study, appears between sections 2 and 3. - Improve the structure of the paper. It does contain too many sections and complicates the reading and understanding. I'd suggest to join some of those sections together - The description of results need to be improved. The structure: XXXXXX has been described herein using means and standard deviations. The study used 5-point likert scale where a mean of 5 suggests that respondents strongly agree to the item, mean of 4 suggests that respondent agree to the item, a mean of 3- suggests that respondents are undecided, a mean of 2- suggests that respondent disagree to the item and a mean of 1- suggests that respondents strongly disagree to the item. <p>It is repeated three times, adding unnecessary repetition The conclusion is a repetition of the findings of the result section. It should be integrated on the recommendation section. In addition, the scientific contribution of the paper should be highlighted</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Sources should be added in some of the tables The foreseen contribution of the study should be enlarged The major finding should be explained more in detail Bibliography should be updated, there is only one references of the last 3 years. A better explanation of the legal framework in Ghana would enrich the paper</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper presents an interesting topic that has been well worked and it is a novelty on the field of public procurement. The statistical methods are justified, and the proposed conceptual framework is consistent. Nevertheless, the paper needs a thoroughly review to correct several areas for improvement detected after the revision from my part. Those are specified on the above rows.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Javier Mendoza Jiménez
Department, University & Country	Universidad de La Laguna, Spain