

# Review of: "Microinsurance: Bibliography of Unclassified Literature"

Michael Omeke<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Kyambogo University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Microinsurance: Bibliography of Unclassified Literature

### Key issues noted:

- The objective of the review process highlighted
- The extensive review of previous studies done (177 studies).
- The write up well articulated with minimal typing or editorial errors
- Summary and conclusion of the review highlighted at the end of the literature review write up
- The literature review focus on the general insurance market, microinsurance market-products, agents, policies, market players, premium, awareness, competition, regulation; explores the microfinance industry in relationship to poverty alleviation and microinsurance

### However,

I note the following for improvement;

- The use of initials in the text. Best practices of literature review should be followed (not to use initials in the text)
- While it is unclassified literature-it would be appropriate to have some bit of coherence and consistency in the flow of the reviewed literature. As it stands, related content is scattered and sometimes speaking about the same thing. Try to align related literature to flow together.
- Much of the literature review was from India with little attention to the rest of the world, which would give a broader comparative analysis
- Minor typing errors were noted-Please proof read your work again for corrections
- It would also be prudent to give your input/insights on some segments of literature review within the text in line with your objective of study as part of your analysis and value addition to extant literature.
- On the summary and conclusion, I would have expected that the summary and conclusion should have been aligned with the study objective of exploring the linkage between ownership structures, size, legal status and efficiency of MFIs in relation to microinsurance. However, the objective is not underpinned in the conclusion-microfinance and insurance concluded independently.
-



Overall, it was a good write up and review process.

**Compiled**

**Omeke Michael (PhD)**

**Reviewer**