

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_98157
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors affect customers` intention to continue using mobile banking services at Vietnam construction joint stock commerce
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajebo.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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Based on the results presented in the manuscript, it is important for the scientific community as it provides useful insights into the factors that affect the intention to continue using mobile banking services in Vietnam.</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) The title of the article is somewhat suitable as it gives a clear indication of the topic and scope of the research.</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a brief overview of the purpose, methodology, and key findings of the study.</p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> The discussion section is appropriately structured and provides a clear and concise analysis of the study results. The implications for businesses are also well-articulated and provide practical insights that can be used to improve the acceptance and usage of mobile banking services. Overall, the manuscript is appropriate and provides valuable information that can help businesses to make informed decisions about the development and marketing of mobile banking services.</p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> The manuscript appears to be based on empirical data and uses statistical analysis to draw conclusions, which is a commonly accepted method in scientific research.</p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> The references should be up-to-date in terms of the current state of research in the relevant field. The manuscript references are insufficient and too old. Please add more new references. I suggest that the authors consider adding more recent studies to support their arguments and ensure the accuracy and relevance of their findings.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article seem suitable for scholarly communications. The writing is clear and concise, and the author uses appropriate terminology and analytical techniques to present their findings.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Hsiu-Jung Chou
Department, University & Country	Cheng Shiu University, Taiwan