

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_94268
Title of the Manuscript:	Hybrid Channel: MSME Collaboration In Digital Marketing In Post Covid-19 (Case Study On MSMEs In Pangkajene Kepulauan Region)
Type of the Article	Original research

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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The topic of the research is practical and contemporary</p> <p>This paper presents very good facts but does not validate such with clarity. Neither it validated many concepts enough with references</p> <p>The abstract is adequate, The abstract does follow its standard structure... showing necessary details So, one is able to know what is the paper about!!</p> <p>However, there is confusing terms....If questionnaires are used then you are using a mix method research with qualitative and quantitaive approaches. A Questionnaire is a quantitative research tool????? Clarify.... Throughout the paper as well especially in the Methodology part....</p> <p>The introduction and background are fair since it is missing many references to several concepts. However, the overall section does present a suitable background but not enough.</p> <p>Though needing proofreading and editing and suggested structural corrections [see attached Corrected Manuscript]</p> <p>Add a brief paragraph about how this paper is divided</p> <p>The methodology is confusing. It presents three sections of the literature review again!!!!.</p> <p>The Methods part is fair and confusing [see suggestions]</p> <p>The results are not actually shown clearly to support the discussion of the findings. No quotes of the interviews with the authors' selected parties?????</p> <p>The Discussion is mostly a literature review again.... And facts are not validated with either quotes from the people interviewed, nor validated further with references [watch for consistency orders of authors]...</p> <p>The conclusion is therefore unclear nor adequate because of the deficiencies described above.</p> <p>Review carefully the write-up of the references for consistency, completeness, and to match the Journal's requirements...Add the missing citations as well, double check that all references are used in the text</p> <p>Proofreading and editing are needed</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Hussin Jose Hejase
Department, University & Country	Al Maaref University, Lebanon