

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_121336
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECT OF DIRECT HEALTH FACILITY FINANCING ON ENROLLMENT INTO HEALTH INSURANCE IN DODOMA REGION, TANZANIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses a crucial aspect of public health financing in Tanzania. By evaluating the impact of Direct Health Facility Financing (DHFF) on health insurance enrollment and service quality, it provides valuable insights into how financing mechanisms can improve healthcare accessibility and quality. I appreciate the manuscript for its thorough examination of DHFF's effects, as it offers practical recommendations for enhancing health services and achieving Universal Health Coverage (UHC).	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "The Effect of Direct Health Facility Financing on Enrollment into Health Insurance in Dodoma Region, Tanzania," is suitable as it clearly indicates the study's focus. However, a slightly refined title could be: "Impact of Direct Health Facility Financing on Health Insurance Enrollment and Service Quality in Dodoma Region, Tanzania."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive, providing a clear overview of the study's objectives, methods, findings, and conclusions. However, it could be enhanced by briefly mentioning the specific challenges identified and the recommendations proposed. This would give readers a more complete snapshot of the study's implications.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is well-organized, with clear sections for the introduction, methods, results, discussion, and conclusions. This logical flow facilitates understanding and ensures that each aspect of the research is thoroughly addressed.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative data, provides a comprehensive analysis of DHFF's impact. The use of in-depth interviews and focus group discussions adds depth to the findings, while the quantitative analysis offers concrete evidence of enrollment trends. The study's conclusions are well-supported by the data, highlighting improvements in service quality and insurance enrollment due to DHFF. Additionally, the recommendations are practical and based on the identified challenges, enhancing the manuscript's relevance and applicability.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references in the manuscript are sufficient and recent, including studies from the last five years that are relevant to the topic. They provide a solid foundation for the research, supporting the background information and findings effectively.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are several areas where improvements can be made to enhance clarity, readability, and grammatical correctness.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Farhang Salehi
Department, University & Country	Iran