

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_97366
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSING FINANCIAL FREEDOM AMONG TEACHERS IN THE CURRENT PANDEMIC SETTING: BASIS FOR INTERVENTION PLAN
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The manuscript is important for the scientific community so as to attract intervention and help.</p> <p>The title is suitable, but there's no need to include "Basis for intervention plan". This can be well stated in the significance/ Justification of the study.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive, though needs to include the sample size and method of analysis.</p> <p>The author needs to add the problem statement and literature review in the subsections of the article. At the same time, other subsections are not necessary like role of the researcher, trustworthiness of the study and research participants.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct, given that it's a qualitative research study.</p> <p>The references are recent and sufficient but not well stated.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English suits scholarly communication in general but with a few areas like the first objective.	
Optional/General comments	Objective one is not well stated. Using the words " current pandemic" may not suit today because it's now becoming history not current. The author should find a better way to present findings than p1.....p15. Literature review should be included with the knowledge gap well stated. In the introduction, the author needs to introduce the pandemic and it's relationship with the financial challenges. Significance of the study comes before theoretical lens. Research problem should be well stated. It differs from a normal problem.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Victoria Kakooza
Department, University & Country	Kyambogo University, Uganda