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Below is my report on this manuscript:

Part 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments
1. Title: Requires modification; suggestion: Blending formal rules with value based approaches toward building effective ethical culture in Tanzania
   Key-words: Most of them are not umbrella in nature and especially Tanzania LGAs, is not a key-word. Suggestions are:
   Behavior modification/regulation, values/ethical education, ethics management, public administration, effective leadership.
2. Methodology: Lines 174-178: on these questions:
   I. Why is unethical behavior still widespread in public service in Tanzania?
   II. How can unethical behavior in Tanzania public service be minimized?
   To answer these questions, the author reviewed both theoretical and empirical literature on ethics management. Government documents and reports
5. Type of manuscript in relation to this Journal:
   JSRR: one of three
   options may be considered:
   I. A fieldwork to be conducted to show evidence
      on position of author before
      the manuscript is published II. The errors are
      corrected and the manuscript
      is referred to another Journal under SDI which is
      less emphatic on
      scientific research.
   III. The errors are corrected and the Editor-in-
      Chief accepts to publish the
      manuscript in JSRR.
6. Author should clearly state significance of the
   research, to indicate
   contribution to knowledge in the field.

**Minor REVISION comments**

Typing errors: need to insert full stop at the end of
several statements.

Other errors are obvious on lines:
37: to abide by, not to abide to
39: one of these factors include, not includes
73: (same as on line 37)

More errors are manifest on lines: 87, 124, 139,
144, 145, 146, 165, 170,
181-182, 186, 206, 212, 260-261, 267, 279, 281,
288, 293, 309, 321, & 323.
**General Comments**

For the manuscript to qualify as scientific, empirical segment of research is required. The write-up is generally clear, however.
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