



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	

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 <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>
<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>	1. Yes, the manuscript important for scientific community. 2. Yes, the title of the article suitable. 3. No, an abstract is a summary of the content highlighting the main points of the work, from a short and concise presentation to approximately 10-15 lines long. Abstract includes a presentation of the importance, or problem the studies, the objective, the tools into data collection with populations and samples, results and conclusions that are clear and comprehensive. 4. Conclusion that does not overlap with the content, but is a conclusion of the issues and important points to comprehensive, clear and complete. 5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. But it needs to be improved and reviewed. 6. Yes.	Revised
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article suitable for scholarly communications.	Okay
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		



GLOBAL PRESS HUB

[GPH Review Form](#)

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>	