

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_128560
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>SASRA Monitoring and Reporting Financial Tools and Financial Performance of Dt-Saccos in Kenya</b>
Type of the 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: 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)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The importance of this manuscript titled <i>SASRA Monitoring and Reporting Financial Tools and Financial Performance of DT-SACCOs in Kenya</i> can be summarized as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Relevance to Socioeconomic Development</li> <li>▪ Addressing Financial Performance Challenges</li> <li>▪ Integration of SASRA's Role</li> <li>▪ Policy and Practical Recommendations</li> </ul>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title of the article is suitable.	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract of the article seems good though there are windows to improve it.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript seems scientifically correct though there its findings invite some debate as like its causation, methodology, and contextual limitations.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references seem sufficient though it is better to involve more relevant and recent publications on this area.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The quality of the English language of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### PART 2:

	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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Gyanendra Prasad Paudel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tribhuvan University, Nepal</b>