

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJEBA_88070 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE OF MICROFINANCE INSTITUTIONS: A COMPARISON OF MODELS OF SUSTAINABILITY AND ITS IMPLICATION ON OUTREACH |
| 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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none">On page 11, the author(s) has mentioned "<i>This study has applied both qualitative and quantitative analysis to justify....</i>" What qualitative analysis is done in the paper? Does it mean the use of questionnaire? Questionnaire is not the part of qualitative analysis. Moreover, the analysis based on primary data (Likert scale and frequency level etc. see page 8) has not been presentedHas the author tested the reliability of the questionnaire? | Comment accepted and considered |
| Minor REVISION comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none">Please mention the study period for secondary data.The research gap needs to be mentioned at the end of the review of literature.What are the unanswered questions addressed in the paper?What is the contribution of this research to the existing literature?Stylized facts about the analysis need to be mentioned.Whom and how this research is useful? | Modified as suggestion |
| Optional/General 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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |