

**Paper: “The Impact of Mobile Technology on Consumers’ Charitable Behaviors:
a Research Protocol”**

Submitted: 18 April 2022

Accepted: 25 July 2022

Published: 31 July 2022

Corresponding Author: Ali Salisu

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n22p225](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n22p225)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

.ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: ESJ 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.

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

Date Manuscript Received: 20/05/22	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/06/22
Manuscript Title: Relationship between Financial Inclusion and Monetary policy on Economic growth:Evidence from Panel Data Draw from a Sample of Developing Countries	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Nil	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
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	

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>(Ok)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>(Needs Revision to clearly identify the gap)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Needs English editing)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Ok)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Ok)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Needs to be revised to tally with findings)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Needs revision)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: