

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_98832
Title of the Manuscript:	Internationalization of SMEs: Revisiting the Theories and Antecedents
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalajebea.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-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 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. This study looks at the relations and mutualities between various internationalization theories and discusses their shortcomings. This article is important for international marketers and multinational companies. 2. The title of the article well expresses the purpose of the research. 3. In the abstract section, concepts such as the purpose of the research, the method of conducting the research, and the results of the research are clearly stated. 4. The structure of the manuscript seems appropriate. 5. I believe that the article is scientifically correct. 6. Since the research method of this article is based on literature review, naturally the references are a little outdated. However, the number of references is sufficient and somewhat high.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the language of the article is relatively good and readable and understandable.	
Optional/General comments	Follow author guidelines	

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:	Milad Farzin
Department, University & Country	Rahedanesh Institute of Higher Education, Iran