

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: JNBMS-059

Title: *A Study of the Benefits and Limitations of Digital and Cash Payments*

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision...Minor.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	✓			
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 215

Detailed Reviewer's Report

REVIEW REPORT

Overall Recommendation:

The manuscript addresses a relevant and contemporary issue concerning the transition from cash-based to digital payment systems in India. It provides a comparative discussion of digital and cash payments, covering convenience, accessibility, security, financial inclusion, digital literacy, and technological dependence. The study is based on secondary sources including RBI, NPCI, IMF, and World Bank materials.

The topic is relevant and the manuscript has practical value; however, substantial improvements are required in the **literature review, research methodology.**

1. Strengths of the Manuscript

1. Relevant research topic:

Digital payments and financial inclusion are important issues in the Indian economic and financial context.

2. Balanced perspective:

The manuscript does not present digital payments as an absolute replacement for cash. It recognizes the continued usefulness of cash under conditions of poor connectivity, limited digital literacy, or technological constraints.

3. Clear objectives and research questions:

The objectives cover the benefits, risks, limitations, and comparative characteristics of both payment methods.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. **Use of credible institutional sources:**

RBI, NPCI, IMF and World Bank are appropriate sources for a study of digital payments and financial inclusion.

5. **Practical recommendations:**

The paper provides suggestions concerning digital literacy, cybersecurity, grievance redressal, accessibility and continued availability of cash.

2. *Comments*

A. Research Methodology Needs Strengthening

The paper describes itself as descriptive and analytical and states that it uses secondary data.

The authors should provide a more detailed methodology explaining the **data sources, selection criteria, analytical framework and limitations of secondary-data research**. The manuscript itself correctly acknowledges that its findings should be interpreted as general trends rather than conclusions about a particular demographic group.

B. Literature Review is Too Limited

A clear **research gap** should be identified at the end of the literature review.

3. *Specific Recommendation for Improvement*

The paper can be substantially improved by adding a **comparative analytical framework**.

The manuscript has publication potential after substantial revision, particularly if the authors strengthen its theoretical foundation, methodological rigor, comparative analysis.

Overall nice paper.