



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_44688
Title of the Manuscript:	Non-Performing Loans (NPL) and Profitability of Microfinance Institutions (MFIs) in Ghana: Evidence from the Kasoa Municipality.
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>My comment will be organized based on the paper's structure. As a conclusion, I will express a general opinion on the research.</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>The way the authors selected the data is not representative or doesn't have strong arguments. An explanation of how the forth MFIs was chosen and also why Kasoa town is important for Ghana is required.</p> <p>The decision of taking into account NPLs as a factor of economic instability in Ghana is not express in details. The questions from the introduction are left with no answers in the objectives of the paper. I recommend to rewrite the introduction based on the relationship between NPLs or other indicators taken into account and macroeconomic stability in Ghana. The accent should be on the advantages of the current research with a reasoned criticism of the existing literature.</p> <p>Literature review:</p> <p>The literature doesn't cover aspects regarding the methodology used by the authors and for this reason I have a concern about the results. The methodology should be validated using other researches.</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <p>The way the sample is chosen is not well argued. The authors are motivating their decision with the "convenience sampling technique", but this approach can be improved using quantitative techniques and having a strong argument based on existing literature.</p> <p>The short sample defined by 4 respondents (1 per company) can be attacked because it has no detailed explanation or motivation. In respect to this thought is also the age of respondents and the positions in companies. My recommendation is to take into account a wider variety of companies from Ghana and experts' positions as well.</p> <p>A quantitative methodology based on an econometric measure can be used by the authors for a greater consistency of their results. A mix approach between survey technique and econometric approach can improve the paper and offer a better position in the existing literature.</p> <p>Conclusions:</p> <p>The robustness of the results is missing. The authors should test if their results are relevant for the market or the subject they used.</p> <p>I consider irrelevant the results because of the sample used. I recommend an increase in companies considered and a diversification of cities / regions from</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Ghana.</p> <p>More focused on results conclusions should be presented in the paper. I couldn't find any proposals for local authorities, as the authors mentioned in the introduction.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>A relation between risks and profitability should be explained better from theoretical and practical perspectives.</p> <p>The way the authors are conducting the research should be better explained by adding details regarding the selection of the respondents and companies.</p> <p>A better structure of the article could help the readers on finding the most important advantages or results of the paper.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The authors should pay more attention on the approach to writing. There are many blank spaces between words, the entire aspect of the research could be improved (pay attention to the figures inserted), and the way of presenting well – known theories must be revised.</p> <p>The critical view of the existing literature is necessary in this research.</p> <p>A detailed and comprehensive presentation of the methodology is mandatory and the role of it is to help researches / regulators on finding how the results can be used in practice.</p>	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ionuț – Daniel POP
Department, University & Country	The Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania