



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_49997
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF ASA MICROCREDIT ON LIVELIHOOD STATUS OF RURAL WOMEN IN SYLHET
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Don't use the abstract to report descriptive statistics. You should focus on the main findings (answers to the research questions).</p> <p>Provide reference(s) for the assertion in lines 39-41</p> <p>From lines 49-53, which literature shows that research about ASA has not gained much importance?</p> <p>The objectives of the study is not sufficient for a paper. The first objective will be addressed by the descriptive statistics of the variables. It leaves only one objective to deal with.</p> <p>The paper has no literature review section. How do we know what previous authors have said about the topic? This is a widely researched topic and there should be abundance of existing literature.</p> <p>The methodology fails to show a reliable model (equation) for measuring impact. The study requires a quantitative approach to impact assessment.</p> <p>From the introduction, the author(s) quote figures for the population of women and rural population, the sample size for this study is not adequate and representative of the population. It makes it difficult to rely on the findings.</p> <p>There is no detailed discussion of the findings in relation to existing literature and supporting theories. It is just a presentation of results.</p> <p>What are the contributions of this study?</p> <p>There is insufficient use of literature for a work of this nature. Eight references is not enough for an empirical study of a widely written topic.</p> <p>The work needs serious editing and proofreading.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Avoid the use of uncommon abbreviations in abstract. For example IGA	
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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ellis Kofi Akwaa-Sekyi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Lleida, Spain</i>