

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_SAJSSSE_98320</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Employer-sponsored Health Insurance (ESHI) Scheme- A New Model of Health Micro Insurance for the Garment Workers in Bangladesh</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1) The manuscript is actually quite important for the scientific committee</p> <p>2) Yes title is suitable</p> <p>3) <b>Abstract comprehensive. However some clarifications required for better Understanding.</b> -Aim: Considering this was actually an observational and not interventional study, I guess the aim should not be based on increasing coverage but rather "To evaluate or determine health service coverage with disease prevention, access to health.....etc" to help take appropriate decisions for betterment of services as intended. - Design: Better to specify the observational design used (I think the it was actually a retrospective observational study considering we were working of secondary data review". - Conclusion: The conclusion in the abstract should be based on the findings with regards to what the study was aimed at and not what the study is intended to get. Thus, need to be reviewed.</p> <p>4) - Bringing out specific objectives clearly would be good - Materials and Methods: Will be good to have brief description of the study design, Study population, Study procedures, Method of Data collection and analysis etc. It will give more elaborate information for better understanding.</p> <p>5) Manuscript is good. However, the above adjustments/clarifications will make it better for publication.</p> <p>6) References okay</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Language is good.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review abstract with regards to the aim, design and conclusory statements</li> <li>- Bring out clearly specific objectives of the study.</li> <li>- More elaborate information required for the materials and method used to carry out study as described under revision comments.</li> <li>- Ethical approval and informed concerned should all be merged as one under "Ethical Consideration".</li> <li>- Conclusions should be more specific and in line with specific objectives/Aim of the study. Reasons why stating specific objectives above is of great importance as requested.</li> </ul>	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Anye Che Jude</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Bamenda, Cameroon</b>

Review Form 1.7