



GLOBAL PRESS HUB

GPH Review Form

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Finance and Management
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJEFM_1603
Title of the Manuscript:	DIGITALIZATION AND EMPLOYEES' PERFORMANCE: EVIDENCE FROM MOBILE TELEPHONE NETWORK (MTN) SOUTHEAST, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Empirical

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:

(<http://www.globalpresshub.com/editorial-policy/1>)

[GPH Review Form](#)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Need to improve. Title does not fully reflect the study. Doable, but upgrade would certainly better Structure is alright. No, as there is no argument but just a mere unsupported idea by the author(s). Not suffiecient As per comment in the draft	Corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need an upgrade for the language.	Okay
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The arguments and ideas are not supported and the author(s) could not grasp the meaning behind the findings.	Noted

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	