

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_85583
Title of the Manuscript:	Electronic Human Resource Management: A Contemporary Overview
Type of the Article	Review 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>On the methodology part it is NOT clear how the research has been conducted, example a bibliometric?</p> <p>On the analysis part there is no explanation on analysis of the data. For example meta analysis maybe?</p>	<p>This is a review paper based on simple literature survey based on the published sources from Web of Science (former ISI), Scopus as well as Google Scholar.</p> <p>As this is a review article, there is no sue of data. All the the information reported in this paper are based on literature search.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Author should not use "I" in the writing as referring to the author." I also expect this....." Instead, use this study hopes to find.... or current research hopes....	The suggestion has been tried to be implemented on the revised version.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The structure of manuscript, should it be the literature review then only comes the research methodology? Author should change the structure of manuscript.</p> <p>Author has all the information, however the structure, the component of research method and analysis of the data were vague.</p>	Yes, this is a review a paper. However, still there is a "Research method" section that explains how the paper has been formed and where the information came from.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	