



## GPH Review Form

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Finance and Management</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Original Manuscript_AJEFM_1603</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>DIGITALIZATION AND EMPLOYEES' PERFORMANCE: EVIDENCE FROM MOBILE TELEPHONE NETWORK (MTN) SOUTHEAST, NIGERIA</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Empirical</b>

### 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>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b>	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	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Need an upgrade for the language.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	The arguments and ideas are not supported and the author(s) could not grasp the meaning behind the findings.	

[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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Nabila Huda Ibrahim
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaya, Malaysia