

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_82535
Title of the Manuscript:	Probing Small and Medium Enterprise’ (SMEs) Uptake on Ecommerce in Camarines Sur, Philippines
Type of the Article	Research article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The paper is interesting as it presents the state of ecommerce in Philippines, that is completely different from developed countries. However, it needs serious improvements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In the literature review the authors have to add a section that reviews relative studies in developing countries (like paper 14), discuss critically their findings, identify the existing gap and debate the contribution of the paper.2. In addition to this, the literature review is not up today. The state of e-commerce changes rapidly so you have to use papers recently published.3. Statistical analysis is limited to Frequencies and percentages. The authors have to go further and use some statistical tests. At least t-tests to investigate defend attitudes between men and women *as the argue about this section 4.1)4. In table 6 please explain the qualitative rating. For what stands “Very often”, or “sometimes”?5. References are not written consistently.	<p>Related literature reviews especially from Phil. Studies had been added.</p> <p>Recently published papers had been added</p> <p>t-test was done</p> <p>qualitative ratings were explained</p> <p>references were re-written to reflect consistency in writing</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Above table 2 the authors mention “are either too old,” too old for what? I am not a native speaker, but please check the use of English	<p>The statement was re-stated.</p>
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	