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	

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.journalajeba.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.6

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	**Introduction**. This section is arguably the most important in any paper as it is the one that can convince the reader to continue reading the whole paper, however, in this one I think it is short and lacking. Authors need to show that the study was conducted based on specific research issues and gaps in this area (e.g. gaps in theory, in practice or between the two). No previous studies are cited to help explaining the problem the study is trying to address. The research issue and gap can only be identified through rigorous review of relevant literature in the study context. I here suggest to rewrite this section and clearly build up the argument to arrive at the research problem citing more studies from the existing body of knowledge in this area especially in the context of the Philippines. **Literature review.** I suggest a more thorough review of literature to improve this section. In general, the literature cited in the paper is very limited and this is reflected in the small number of references in the references list. To overcome this shortcoming more recent and relevant literature should be added especially reviewing studies on similar contexts (developing countries and south east Asia specifically the Philippines). **Methodology**. More information need to be added to this section e.g. the type of investigation in the paper (exploratory, explanatory etc), how the questionnaire was prepared, how was it distributed (personally administered, mailed or emailed), the sample size, the reason for employing purposive sampling, were any interviews conducted (there is a mention of interviews in the results section), how the secondary data was used, what analysis techniques were used to arrive at the results. **Results**. Participants profile (age, gender etc) and businesses characteristics (years in business and business sector) are usually included to be used as independent variables in a regression analysis for example. This is not the case in this paper. I cannot see how they contributed towards the paper's results in the light of its context. I suggest these to be removed. There is a need to explain how the factors in table 7 have been ranked. The authors need to elaborate more on the results and provide more insightful discussion in order to add meaningful contribution to the extent literature in this area of research.	
Minor REVISION comments	**Abstract**. No need to include introductory sentences. Start with the purpose of the paper and briefly and clearly inform the reader about the methodology used and the main results without citing any numbers (percentages etc.). No need to include all the recommendations; just the main ones, one or two maximum. **Conclusion**. I suggest incorporating the recommendation with the conclusion section in paragraphs and not in bullets. Is there any practical or policy implications based on the results?, any suggestions for future research. **References**. I was not sure what style of referencing is being used in the paper. Upon finishing the revision the references list (and the whole paper) should be checked to ensure it conforms with the journal guideline.	
Optional/General comments	The paper can benefit from good proofreading.	

Review Form 1.6

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Abdulaziz Abdulsaleh**
Department, University & Country	**Omar Al Mokhtar University, Libya**