

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_SAJSSSE_105210</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Empirical Investigation of Relationship Between Banks' Lending Rate and Coffee Export Growth in Tanzania</b>
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:

(<https://www.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/editorial-policy> )

### 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><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The manuscript is somewhat important to the scientific community.</li> <li>The title of the article is ok and suitable.</li> <li>The abstract is quite comprehensive though a bit too long. I would recommend a compressed summary.</li> <li>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are definitely not appropriate. They depict what is usually given in a thesis and not manuscript. For example, the subsections under 'Introduction' part are not necessary. Give brief descriptions of all sections without including too many subsections.</li> <li>The manuscript is scientifically correct though the manuscript is very weak. It is not enough to just produce standard models or equations without giving a motivation. Work on a detailed methodology by explaining the models further and show how they important to your study and analysis.</li> <li>The references look ok.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	The author need to improve on the language and check on the typos.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	None.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Patrick Weke</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Nairobi, Kenya</b>