



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_35580
Title of the Manuscript:	CRITICAL FACTORS FOR SUPPLIERS' ASSESSMENT AND SELECTION: EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FROM PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS IN A DEVELOPING COUNTRY
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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>)

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	- The paper examined the critical factors that influence the selection of suppliers in the Brong Ahafo and Ashanti regions of Ghana in 100 public institutions Employed descriptive and survey research design by Self-administered questionnaire to collect data from the respondents. However, I could not find literature review on that. I recommend incorporating comprehensive literature on public procurement , supplier selection criteria and strategies, drawing research gaps and limitations of current literature, - Methodology is not completed and has to be extended. - Conclusion should be extended by clearly mentioning the novelty of the paper followed by some future suggestions.	These issues have been addresses as follows: Public Procurement: Subsection 2.1 from 80 to 114 Supplier Selection Criteria and Strategies: Subsection 2.3 (line 140 to 185) and Subsection 2.4 from 187 to 250 Research gaps and limitations of current literature: From 251 to 259 The Methodology is complete: see line 261 to 298 This is stated in lines 567 to 569 and 573 to 576
Minor REVISION comments	The grammatical proof is required.	The work is read over again
Optional/General comments		