

### 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**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The paper determined the levels of participation and registration in health insurance schemes among beneficiaries following the implementation of DHFF (Direct Health Facility Financing). You can find out details about the quality of medicines and the effectiveness of the supply chain, through respondents, medical personnel and patients.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is.	
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 of the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the structure is appropriate.	
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.	I expected to find a table of values in the work from which to derive the enrolment of community members. In the table you can specify the number of customers before and after the application of DHFF, in different areas. I found the Table 1 and the Figure 1 after References. Wasn't it better to be integrated in the text of the work, at the results?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Yes.	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is. On page 3 I wrote a word in red in the text (a recommendation for expression).	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

### Review Form 3

#### **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>Papadatu Carmen-Penelopi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>"Dunarea de Jos" University from Galati, Romania</b>