

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_121449
Title of the Manuscript:	THE MEDIATING ROLE OF FINANCIAL LITERACY IN THE CHARACTERISTICS OF MSMES AND FINANCIAL TECHNOLOGY ON MSME SUSTAINABILITY
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 <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 manuscript provides the relation between financial literacy, characteristics of MSMEs and financial technology with respect to sustainability of MSMEs that what is the effect of these factors on sustainability of MSMEs. The author has used hypothesis and financial literacy as the mediating variable.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	fine	
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.	no	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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 uses hypothesis and mediation as the tool in their analysis. The research framework is clearly defined there is no problem regarding the technicality of the manuscript the tools are correctly used.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	fine	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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:	Divyanshu Panwar
Department, University & Country	Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, India