

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_119148
Title of the Manuscript:	Teachers' Financial Literacy in Basic Education: A Case Study in Davao City
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Manuscript is based on one of the city in Philippines namely Davao. It definitely has impact and importance for research community. Title states the basic education and teachers whereas most of the data collection is from secondary school teachers, in that light if amendments can be made in the title. Research questions also states about secondary teachers. Is secondary education is basic Education? If so, the nowhere in the paper basic education is defined by definition or by scope. Are other teachers like primary and high school included? If not, this set is not universal, so referring it as teacher's is incorrect and not justified. Abstract is good, Abstract didn't justify what basic education is and how basic education of secondary teacher would lead to financial literacy. If author should add a sentence about what basic education is, it would give strong basis to abstract and to the research paper. It's in structure. It's appropriate, author should define what basic education is? Scope is only for secondary teacher, I fail to understand the co-relation between basic education and financial literacy. If 2-3 literature review could be added related what basic education is, how it is related to secondary teacher and then to financial literacy. Article has defined the means but not on the track towards the end. Also, study is limited to one city. Reference are sufficient and recent. More in-depth literature on connections between financial literacy, secondary education and teachers could develop more sense to this paper. <p>Additional comments:</p> <p>The research is based on the evidence and data which is taken from 7 teachers only. The scope could have been enlarged. It's for future recommendation.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Title could be changed, its authors discretion. As title states Teachers whereas article depicts about the secondary teachers not all the teachers.</p> <p>Also, study is limited to one study, comparative study of different study would make more impact and larger sample would give more accuracy and visibility to research. Also, research is limited to two or three themes, It should have been diversified.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall a very nice piece of work, Well done.</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:	Neha Sharma
Department, University & Country	Panjab University, India