



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_50803
Title of the Manuscript:	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FINANCIAL LITERACY AND ITS COMPONENT: A RESEARCH ON WORKING WOMEN
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>Title</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Relevant <p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Fairly done ➤ Correct the highlighted mistakes ➤ A part from Pearson correlation coefficient, include descriptive statistics of frequency counts and percentages as a method of data analysis employed in this study(demographic characteristics of respondents) <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Fairly done ➤ However, correct the grammar errors. <p>Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Correct the grammar errors and sentence structures ➤ Indicate the study locale ➤ Identify the research design and provide reason for the choice ➤ Clearly identify the scale on which the questionnaire is anchored i.e. whether it is a 5 point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree <p>Results and Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Lacks coherency ➤ Provide caption for tables ➤ Correct grammar errors and sentence structures ➤ Discuss the reliability of the instrument under methodology ➤ However, include relevant previous studies that supports/oppose the findings of your study to make your findings more robust. <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Fairly done <p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Satisfactory 	Correction made in the manuscript
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ State the objective(s) of the study ➤ Have the recommendations for this study 	
Optional/General comments	N/A	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	