

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_119350
Title of the Manuscript:	Challenges and Prospects of Housing Finance Sector: A Comprehensive Study in the Context of Bangladesh.
Type of the Article	

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The housing finance ecosystem article deserves a slot in the scientific community. However, changes maybe done in the paper to make it more acceptable.</p> <p>The title is suitable. On the other hand, abstract is very limited. The paper's abstract should include major aspects such as 1) the overall purpose of the study and the research problem(s) you investigated; 2) the basic design of the study; 3) major findings or trends found as a result of your analysis; and, 4) a brief summary of your interpretations and conclusions. Unfortunately, this paper is incomprehensive.</p> <p>The subsections and structure is appropriate but needs revision and critical data analysis.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, it is scholarly but minor grammatical errors can be checked.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Comments given: The methodology is incomplete since the author did not specify if its qualitative or quantitative. He should also justify why use of qualitative is better in doing research in financial sector.</p> <p>The author failed to analyze the government programs cited? This is research hence, he/she should provide data analysis on that info provided. Specifically, he should stipulate what happened to those programs. Did it really help the prospective beneficiaries.</p> <p>The policy recommendations is incomplete. He/she should relate the data and findings before policy recommendations. Current documents seem to be used information dissemination, not a journal article. Moreover, challenges and constraints will come from the data you presented. Try to relate the data for every challenge and constraints</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Ma. Josephine Therese Emily G. Teves
Department, University & Country	University of the Philippines Manila, Philippines