### 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:

### Review Form 1.6

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compulsory REVISION comments</th>
<th>Minor REVISION comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewer's comment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Author's comment</strong> (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)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Compulsory REVISION comments

- **Topic**
  The study topic of "working capital management cycle and profitability of retail supermarkets in Mombasa, Kenya: a case study of binathman household supermarket in Mombasa city" is good and current

  **RECOMMENDATION**
  - The topic is good and satisfactory

- **Abstract**
  - The abstract is good and satisfactorily constructed. It has covered all the components of a good abstract.
  - **RECOMMENDATION**
    - The abstract provides a holistic overview of the study. However, the abstract is too long. It should be short and precise

- **Background**
  - The general background of the study is satisfactorily covered
  - The problem addressed by the study is satisfactory
  - **RECOMMENDATION**
    - The researcher should consider adding some statistics to strengthen the argument of the study.

- **Literature review:**
  - The Theoretical review in the study is satisfactory
  - The study’s Empirical review is satisfactorily done.

- **Methodology**
  - The study methodology is satisfactory. However, the study methodology is silent on the assumption of a regression model.
  - **RECOMMENDATION**
    - Summarise the assumptions regression model tested in the diagnostics test and conclude if they hold or not.

- **RESULTS**
  - Are satisfactory

- **Discussions and conclusions**
  - Discussions should be based on the variables under the study as well as linked to the theories under review
  - Bibliography and citations
    - Bibliography and citations are satisfactorily done.

#### Optional/General comments
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<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>Author’s comment <em>(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)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</td>
<td><em>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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