

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_116352
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception of Financial Inclusion and Empowerment Index in Pondicherry
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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	The title of the article is scientifically acceptable and interesting. The abstract is also precise which convey the standard information. But I do have a comment on some outdated references and the method of data analysis must be strong. Additionally there must be a mechanism that will help to isolate the effect of the national pilot project on financial inclusion on empowerment.	I agree with the reviewer and necessary corrections were made in the manuscript
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is suitable and appropriate.	I agree with the reviewer
<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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No ethical issues