



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_7487
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Regulation in Micro Finance: Jurisdictional Analysis
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:

(<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		
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract – Good summary of the study (meets the criteria) Introduction – The author introduced the topic well. However, it is recommended that the author summarize the objective, significance of the study and scope of the study together in a new paragraph at the end of Section 1 and link with Section 2. (no need to separate objective, significance and scope in a different part under Section 1) Literature – it is well structured. However, it would be much better if the author could include the latest references (after 2010) Methodology – The methodology is well defined. However, the structure does not follow the normal structure used in international journal. Normally, methodology should be presented in Section 3 (after the Literature review). I would strongly recommend that the author adhere to the normal international standards. Results – written in an appropriate manner Conclusion – The author precisely conclude the study. Recommendation – I recommend that the author add a new section for Recommendation after the section of Conclusion.	Immense thanks for the hugely beneficial comments. Summary of the objective, significance of the study and scope of the study have been undertaken - in a new paragraph at the end of Section 1 and linked with Section 2. Methodology has been moved to conform with international standards. Latest references have been included under literature review. Results of objectives of study have been incorporated under the conclusion section in a more appropriate form.
Optional/General comments	This is a good manuscript and should be accepted for publication. However, English grammar is wanting in some areas. It is the sole responsibility of the author to check the plagiarism (if any)	Grammar and plagiarism checked to ensure that acceptable standards are met.