

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJARR_97366</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ASSESSING FINANCIAL FREEDOM AMONG TEACHERS IN THE CURRENT PANDEMIC SETTING: BASIS FOR INTERVENTION PLAN</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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. <b>It is important.</b></p> <p>2. <b>The title is suitable.</b></p> <p>3. <b>The abstract needs some amendments.</b></p> <p>4. <b>The sections are appropriate but some other sections are not mentioned.</b></p> <p>5. <b>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</b></p> <p>6. <b>The references are sufficient.</b></p> <p>7. <b>Some other points include the following?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Editing is required.</b></li> <li>- <b>The research gap, populations and research design are not clear in the abstract.</b></li> <li>- <b>Recommendations are needed in the abstract.</b></li> <li>- <b>The study sample is not mentioned in the abstract.</b></li> <li>- <b>When using 'et al' it is to be italicized.</b></li> <li>- <b>In 1.4 the beneficiaries are to be numbered.</b></li> <li>- <b>In 1.5, the researchers talk about the limit or scope of the study rather than limitations.</b></li> <li>- <b>The section of Literature review is missing as well as the previous studies.</b></li> <li>- <b>What is the point in numbering the references in the Reference List at the end? Inside the research paper, the APA system is used while in the reference list it is not used. So, reconsider the Reference list in light of the APA system.</b></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is suitable but needs some editing.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nawal Fadhil Abbas</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Baghdad, Iraq</b>