

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_115872
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants of access to financial services Among Adults in Tanzania: The Evidence from FinScope Tanzania Survey 2017
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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> <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>i. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the determinants of financial inclusion in Tanzania, shedding light on key factors like age, education, and income that impact access to financial services among adults.</p> <p>ii. Yes, the title "Determinants of Access to Financial Services Among Adults in Tanzania: The Evidence from FinScope Tanzania Survey 2017" is suitable as it clearly indicates the focus of the research and the source of data used, providing a concise overview of the study's scope and context.</p> <p>iii. The abstract of the article provides a comprehensive overview of the research, including the background, methodology, key findings, and implications. It effectively summarizes the study's objectives, methods, and results, making it comprehensive for readers to understand the essence of the research.</p> <p>iv. The subsections and structure of the manuscript seem appropriate, as they effectively organize the content and make it easy to navigate. However, some minor adjustments in the organization of subsections could further enhance clarity.</p> <p>v. Overall, the manuscript appears scientifically correct, with clear methodologies and data analysis.</p> <p>vi. The references provided are relevant and recent, contributing to the scholarly context of the research. Adding a few more recent references, particularly from the past 3-5 years, could further enrich the discussion and support the study's findings.</p>	<p>i. Ok</p> <p>ii. Ok</p> <p>iii. Ok</p> <p>iv. The manuscript organized accordingly as suggested</p> <p>v. Ok</p> <p>vi. Current literatures added as recommended and highlighted yellow</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>i. The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. However, there are areas where improvements can be made for better clarity and academic presentation. Proofreading for grammatical accuracy, sentence structure refinement, and ensuring consistent academic language throughout would enhance the overall quality of the article's language for scholarly communication.</p>	<p>Language checked and improved to ensure good presentation of the work</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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