

Review Form (Research)

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
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
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1. This article contributes to academics' understanding of behavioral research on financial topics. 2. The variables/models studied are novel. 3. This article presents the results of its data processing comprehensively. 4. The research results can be used as a reference for future research.	

PART 2.1 (Objective Evaluation)

	Rating of the Reviewers	Author's Feedback
1. Is the title clear and appropriate for the study? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3	
2. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3	
3. Are the keywords appropriate and useful? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	4	
4. Is the background information of the paper sufficient and well organized? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3	
5. Are the research objectives/hypotheses clearly stated? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	2	
6. Is the literature review relevant and up to date? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3	
7. Is the research methodology appropriate for the study? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3	
8. Were ethical issues properly addressed (if applicable)? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3	
9. Are the results presented clearly? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	2	
10. Are tables and figures clear, relevant, and necessary? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3	
11. Does the discussion relate findings to existing literature? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	2	
12. Are the conclusions supported by the data? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	2	

Review Form (Research)

	Rating of the Reviewers	Author's Feedback
13. Are the limitations of the study discussed? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	N/A	
14. Are the references relevant and sufficient (in number)? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3	
15. Is the manuscript written in clear and understandable language? Rating Scale: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Satisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Poor N/A = Not Applicable	3	

PART 2.2 (Subjective Evaluation)

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Is the title of the article suitable? If your answer is NO, please provide a brief, clear suggestion for improvement.	YES	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is NO, please provide a brief, clear suggestion for improvement.	YES	
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? If your answer is NO, please provide a brief, clear suggestion for improvement.	NO The writing needs improvement, both in the presentation of each section, the accuracy of the writing, and the structure of sentences and paragraphs. The underlying theory is not yet clear. The hypothesis development section needs further clarification. A discussion section is presented for each hypothesis.	Writings have been improved. Each hypothesis has is discussed separately in discussion section.
Are the references sufficient and recent? (YES or NO) If your answer is NO, please provide clear suggestion for improvement.	YES	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? (YES or NO) (If yes, kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	NO	Ethical issues have been addressed. 19-20pp.