

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_121145
Title of the Manuscript:	Microfinance, Financial Inclusion and Economic Welfare: A Panel Investigation
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it explores the impact of microfinance on financial inclusion and economic welfare through a panel investigation. The study offers valuable insights into how microfinance initiatives contribute to economic development and financial access in various contexts. By addressing this relationship, the paper provides empirical evidence that can inform policymakers and practitioners on the effectiveness of microfinance programs. Its findings have the potential to influence future research and practical applications in the field of economic development and financial inclusion.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is generally appropriate as it reflects the core topics addressed in the manuscript. However, to enhance clarity and specificity, you might consider a slightly revised title:</p> <p>Suggested Title: <i>"Impact of Microfinance on Financial Inclusion and Economic Welfare: A Panel Data Analysis"</i></p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a succinct summary of the study's objectives, methodology, and key findings. However, it could be enhanced by including a brief mention of the specific contributions of the study to existing literature and practical implications. Adding a sentence about their relevance to current debates in microfinance would strengthen the abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript is appropriate, with clear subsections that logically present the research problem, methodology, results, and discussion. This organization facilitates a coherent flow of information and aids in understanding the research findings.</p> <p>Scientific Correctness and Robustness: The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its use of a panel data approach, which allows for a nuanced analysis of the relationship between microfinance, financial inclusion, and economic welfare. The methodology is clearly described, and the results are supported by empirical data, enhancing the credibility of the findings. The study's approach to addressing the research questions through rigorous statistical analysis adds to its scientific validity.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The references appear to be sufficient for the scope of the study. However, it is advisable to ensure that the references include recent studies and key papers in the field of microfinance and financial inclusion. Adding a few recent articles or seminal works could further strengthen the literature review.</p> <p>Additional References Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recent reviews on microfinance and economic development • Key papers on the impact of financial inclusion from the last few years 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the manuscript are generally suitable for scholarly communication. Minor revisions for clarity and conciseness may enhance the readability of the paper.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>To provide constructive minor revision comments for a manuscript:</p> <p>1. Literature Review</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Citations: Some citations in the literature review are missing or incomplete. Ensure all referenced works are correctly cited.• Integration: The literature review should integrate the studies better to highlight gaps that this study addresses. <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Correct and complete citations where needed.• Improve the integration of the literature to better show how this study fills the identified gaps. <p>2. Data Analysis and Results</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clarity: Some of the results are presented in a confusing manner. Ensure that all figures and tables are clearly labeled and referenced.• Details: Provide more explanation on the statistical methods used in the analysis. <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improve the labeling and referencing of figures and tables for clarity.• Add a brief explanation of the statistical methods used in the analysis. <p>3. Discussion and Conclusion</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consistency: Ensure that the discussion and conclusion sections are consistent with the results presented. Some statements in these sections seem to overreach the data.• Implications: Expand on the practical implications of the findings. <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Align the discussion and conclusions more closely with the results.• Elaborate on the practical implications of the study's findings. <p>Overall, the manuscript is a valuable contribution to the literature on microfinance and economic welfare. Addressing the minor revisions and incorporating the suggested improvements could enhance its impact and clarity. The study's findings are relevant and timely, contributing to ongoing discussions in the field.</p>	

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:	R. Arun
Department, University & Country	St. Joseph's College of Engineering, India