



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Abstract is the face of the report (manuscript). So it has to incorporate sufficient information. It seems good if you incorporate additional information like why and how of the survey. - Some of the secondary data utilized was not discussed in the findings. Providing some discussion of those figures will make the findings part attractive. - The conclusion part must boldly reflect the theme of the research and the objectives you set at the beginning. But it emphasises on the benefits side only. The role of regulation (Jurisdictional) which is the research topic and other objectives has to boldly come out to show that you attained your objectives. Please, check whether you really address all your objectives at the end	Immense thanks for the hugely beneficial comments. Title of the paper has been amended to reflect focus of the study. I wish to focus on the objectives of the study and how these could be achieved through the Micro Savings Requirement Scheme. These have been redefined under the findings and conclusion section,



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In your methodology part you talked about identifying the reason for not having access to microfinance and propose a solution to eliminate those problems. Do you think you addressed this issue?	As highlighted under the intro section, owing to the extant literature on the topic, as well as findings which have revealed that low income clients would rather build and consolidate on assets which help in reducing risk before they start incurring debt, micro savings has been focused on. The largely informal sectors operating in rural areas, as well as inadequate levels of monitoring and asymmetric information has made it more necessary for regulation to play a role. Through the proposed Micro Savings Requirement Scheme, this scheme has not only provided a means for assisting those in rural areas to secure collaterals more easily, but also introduced arrangements whereby greater formalism could be introduced into the informal sector.
---	---	---