

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_97904
Title of the Manuscript:	CREDIT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND LOAN DEFAULT IN DEPOSIT MONEY BANKS (DMBs) IN OSUN STATE, NIGERIA
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.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)
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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>Manuscripts are important for the scientific community, especially in the field of economics</p> <p>The title is appropriate</p> <p>The abstract is incomplete, the conclusions in the abstract are replaced with the implications of the research results</p> <p>The sub-sections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate, it is necessary to add research hypotheses, in-depth discussion of the results and the concluding sections include a summary of research findings, recommendations, limitations and suggestions for future research</p> <p>The manuscript is not completely scientifically correct, it needs revision to make it better</p> <p>References are sufficient but need to be added to the most recent (last five years).</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the language/English of the article is suitable for scientific communication	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Endri Endri
Department, University & Country	Universitas Mercu Buana, Indonesia