

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: **“Microfinance Banks, Small and Medium Scale Enterprises and COVID- 19 Pandemic in Nigeria”**

Corresponding Author: Aderemi Timothy Ayomitunde
Email: aderemi.timothy@gmail.com

Doi: 10.19044/elj.v8no2a1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Robert N. Diotalevi
Florida Gulf Coast University, USA

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 30.06.2021



ELP Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ELP promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ELP editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ELP out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 2/17/21	Date Review Report Submitted: 2/17/21
Manuscript Title: Impact of Microfinance Banks on Small and Medium Scale Enterprises in Nigeria: An Implication for COVID-19 Pandemic	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i>
------------------	----------------------



	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
------------------------------	--



Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Good content, writing and analysis here.

I would suggest breaking up into more paragraphs for clarity's sake.

There are some areas where there is a need to write then cite; some areas have too much citing.

The title seems a bit wordy also.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

