

Review Form (Research)

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms AJEBA 157336
Title of the Manuscript:	PSYCHOLOGICAL BELIEFS AND FINANCIAL WELL-BEING AMONG WORKING ADULTS IN GHANA: THE MEDIATING ROLE OF FINANCIAL BEHAVIOR
Type of the Article	Research Article

PART 1 (Importance of the manuscript)

	Comments of the Reviewers	Author's Feedback
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community.</b> A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This paper deals with a real gap in the personal finance literature. Most research on financial well-being focuses on Western populations or university students, so a study of working adults in Ghana is a welcome addition. The PLS-SEM mediation model is OK for these research questions, and the findings are relevant to policymakers and financial educators in similar lower-middle-income contexts. The contribution has value, but this is diminished by a number of methodological and presentational problems (see below).	

PART 2.1 (Objective Evaluation)

	Rating of the Reviewers	Author's Feedback
<b>1. Is the title clear and appropriate for the study?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4 – Good. The title reflects the content well, but "psychological beliefs" is not clear and does not map cleanly onto the three constructs actually measured (SFK, FA, LOC).	Constructs have been added to the title. See page 1.
<b>2. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	2 – Needs improvement. The abstract is written in a loose, informal style that is not appropriate for a scholarly journal. It reports no statistical findings at all, so a reader cannot get any sense of the paper's contribution from the abstract alone.	Abstract has been improved. See first page.
<b>3. Are the keywords appropriate and useful?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	2 – Needs improvement. Only four keywords are provided. "Locus of control" is missing, despite being a primary independent variable. "Ghana" and "Sub-Saharan Africa" are also absent, which will hurt discoverability.	Keywords have been increased to 7.
<b>4. Is the background information of the paper sufficient and well organized?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3 – Satisfactory. The introduction identifies the research gap reasonably well. The writing quality is uneven in places, and the case for urgency leans heavily on a single PwC (2020) corporate survey statistic.	
<b>5. Are the research objectives/hypotheses clearly stated?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	<b>3 – Satisfactory.</b> The nine hypotheses (H1a–H5c) are clearly worded and each links to a specific variable relationship, but the paper never states an overarching research objective or question as a single explicit statement, which is a noticeable gap.	A research objective has been added. See page 3.
<b>6. Is the literature review relevant and up to date?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3 – Satisfactory. Most sources are from 2020–2024 and the main constructs are covered adequately, but the review reads as a loose collection of summaries rather than a coherent argument, and several points about LOC and FA are repeated across subsections without adding anything new.	
<b>7. Is the research methodology appropriate for the study?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	2 – Needs improvement. PLS-SEM with a cross-sectional design is a reasonable choice for this kind of mediation study, but recruiting participants via WhatsApp, Facebook, and LinkedIn produces a convenience sample, and applying Yamane's (1967) formula to justify the sample size in that context is not methodologically defensible.	Has been removed.
<b>8. Were ethical issues properly addressed (if applicable)?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	2 – Needs improvement. The paper states that ethical guidelines were followed, but names no ethics committee, provides no approval number, and does not explain how informed consent was obtained from participants recruited through social media.	How informed consent was obtained has been addressed on page 7.
<b>9. Are the results presented clearly?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3 – Satisfactory. Beta coefficients, t-statistics, and p-values are reported in a reasonably readable format, but Table 11 contains two rows incorrectly labelled "FWB -> FWB" that appear to represent the "SFK -> FB" and "FA -> FB" paths, which is an awkward error that makes those results hard to interpret.	Has been addressed see Table 11.
<b>10. Are tables and figures clear, relevant, and necessary?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	2 – Needs improvement. The tables are mostly readable and relevant, but Figure 1 is dropped into the text with its significant details (e.g. the H1a, H2b, etc. relationships) undefined and unexplained, even though they are later used as hypotheses. Also, Figures 2 and 3 have micro-sized fonts	Figure 1, 2, 3 has been worked on to make them readable.

**Review Form (Research)**

	Rating of the Reviewers	Author's Feedback
	and are too low in resolution, making it difficult to read/verify the reported loadings and path coefficients.	
<b>11. Does the discussion relate findings to existing literature?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3 – Satisfactory. The discussion connects the main findings to prior studies in a workmanlike way, but it is largely descriptive and confirmatory, and the null finding for LOC, which is possibly the most interesting result in the paper, is dealt with only briefly rather than being properly explored.	
<b>12. Are the conclusions supported by the data?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3 – Satisfactory. The main conclusions follow from the reported results, but the policy recommendations are stated with more confidence (or even ‘overstated’) than a cross-sectional convenience sample of 444 participants really warrants.	
<b>13. Are the limitations of the study discussed?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	2 – Needs improvement. The limitations section is too brief and misses several obvious issues, including the inability to establish causality from a cross-sectional design, the self-selection bias introduced by social media recruitment, and the potential for social desirability bias in self-reported financial data.	Has been worked on.
<b>14. Are the references relevant and sufficient (in number)?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3 – Satisfactory. The reference list is large and mostly current, but several entries appear twice in slightly different formats (e.g. Iramani & Lutfi (2021), Hashmi et al. (2021)), and formatting is inconsistent throughout, with some entries in all-caps, others not, some entries including DOIs, and others not, etc.	Has been worked on. See reference
<b>15. Is the manuscript written in clear and understandable language?</b> Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	2 – Needs improvement. The writing is uneven throughout, shifting register between sections, and the abstract in particular is written in a colloquial style that honestly isn't OK for a scholarly journal.	The writings have been worked on.

**PART 2.2 (Subjective Evaluation)**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b>  If your answer is NO, please provide a brief, clear suggestion for improvement.	Yes, broadly. A more focused term than "psychological beliefs" could be used, or the three constructs could be named in a subtitle.	The constructs have been added to the title.
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  If your answer is NO, please provide a brief, clear suggestion for improvement.	No. It should be rewritten in a standard academic format, including elements covering study purpose, sample, method, key quantitative results, and main conclusion. The current version omits all numerical findings and reads more like a summary for a general audience than a scholarly abstract.	The abstract has been rewritten.
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically correct?</b>  If your answer is NO, please provide a brief, clear suggestion for improvement.	Partially. The PLS-SEM approach and validity reporting are broadly sound. However, the application of Yamane's (1967) formula to a convenience sample is not correct, as the formula assumes random sampling from a known finite population. The Harman single-factor test (36.5% variance) is reported as sufficient evidence against common method bias, but for many years this test has been acknowledged as being insufficient on its own. The Table 11 labelling error also constitutes a factual inaccuracy in the results.	The application of Yamane's (1967) has been deleted. Corrections in Table 11 has been made.
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent?</b> (YES or NO)  If your answer is NO, please provide clear suggestion for improvement.	Yes, mostly. The main problems are the duplicate entries and inconsistent formatting, both of which should be tidied up before resubmission.	The references have been tidied up.
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> (YES or NO)  (If yes, kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	Yes. The paper does not identify the approving ethics body or provide an approval reference number. For a study collecting personal financial data from human participants, this is an omission that needs to be corrected. The online convenience recruitment via social media also raises questions about informed consent procedures that, from what I can see, are not addressed anywhere in the paper.	The ethical issues have been addressed.

