

Review of: "Overcoming Barriers: Enhancing Women's Access to Financial Services for Agribusiness in Uganda – An Empirical Review"

Ylva Nyberg¹

¹ Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review of: Overcoming Barriers: Enhancing Women's Access to Financial Services for Agribusiness in Uganda – An Empirical Review

- Topic is highly relevant even if it does not come out clearly in the manuscript.
- Language is simple and easy to read but would benefit from some English editing. I would suggest a proper language check.
- Introduction and literature review had quite some overlaps, and it would have been better to exclude the literature review if it didn't add more and incorporate the additions in the introduction. More references are needed - also from studies outside Uganda.
- I lacked research questions and hypotheses. Actually, I was not sure of the motivation for writing this article since the "new knowledge" it would add was not clearly described.
- "The researchers reviewed studies conducted by " e.g., here in methodology, the language is not clear.
- 10 articles reviewed, how and why were those chosen? I do not call it a systematic examination since the method or reasons why only those were chosen were not even described.
- The results were minimal, and to call 1 article empirical evidence is unfortunately just a sign of not really understanding what empirical means.
- The article would have needed data on the situation for women in Uganda, either quantitative or qualitative.
- The discussion did not talk about the underlying causes of each of the barriers and had no references at all. There was also no mentioning of how or if this also can be valid for other areas than Uganda, which I think it is.
- Without a proper aim to fill an identified research gap, it cannot be published.
- Overall, I think the topic is interesting and a lot can be done here, and also this is a potentially good start for a manuscript – but it is far too "thin" and lacks both a proper aim, methodology description, results, and a valid discussion, which unfortunately makes it impossible to publish. To me, it is more like a little bit too long and unclear abstract. My suggestion to the authors is to read more published papers and learn from them how to build up a scientific paper. With thorough work behind it, this title can really have potential.
- Thanks!

