

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_119387
Title of the Manuscript:	Selected Pearls Indicators and Financial Performance of Deposit Taking Savings and Credit Co-Operative Societies in Kenya
Type of the 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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript has the potential to significantly impact both the academic field and the practical management of DT-SACCOs by providing valuable insights, addressing critical gaps, and supporting informed decision-making.</p> <p>It is clear and specific, making it easy for readers to understand the study's subject matter.</p> <p>The abstract is well-structured and informative, covering all essential aspects of the study. It successfully conveys the importance of the research, the methodology used, and the significant findings. However, minor grammatical improvements and clarity in a few sentences would enhance readability. For instance, revising "Notwithstanding, WOCCU has recommended the PEARLS framework" to "To address these issues, WOCCU has recommended the PEARLS framework" would improve clarity. Additionally, clarifying the sentence "The current study assessed how the chosen PEARLS which were regarded as impacting on the financial performance of Kenyan DT-SACCOs in an effort to close the knowledge gap" for better readability could be beneficial. Overall, it is a well-done abstract that effectively summarizes the research study.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Ok</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the manuscript is generally suitable for scholarly communications, but it could benefit from some improvements to enhance clarity and readability.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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:	Farhang Salehi
Department, University & Country	Iran