

ReviewForm 1.7

JournalName:	AsianJournalofEconomics,BusinessandAccounting
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AJEBA_103372
TitleoftheManuscript:	THEROLEOFE-WALLETAPPSONMILLIENNIALMOTHER'SFINANCIALBEHAVIOR
TypeoftheArticle	OriginalResearchArticle

Generalguidelinefor PeerReviewprocess:

Thisjournal'speerreviewpolicystatesthat**NO**manuscriptsshouldberejectedonlyonthebasisof'**lackofNovelty**',providedthemanuscriptis scientificallyrobustandtechnically sound.ToknowthecompleteguidelineforPeerReviewprocess,reviewersarerequestedtovisitthis link:

(<https://www.journalajeba.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

ReviewForm 1.7

PART1:ReviewComments

	Reviewer'scomment	Author'scomment <i>(ifagreedwithreviewer,correct themanuscriptandhighlightthatpartinthe manuscript.Itis mandatorythatauthorsshouldwrite his/herfeedbackhere)</i>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISIONcomments</p> <p>1. Isthemanuscript important forscientific community? (Please writefewsentenceson thismanuscript)</p> <p>2. Isthetitleofthearticlesuitable? (Ifnotpleasesuggest analternativetitle)</p> <p>3. Isthe abstract ofthearticlecomprehensive?</p> <p>4. Aresubsectionsandstructureof themanuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you thinkthemanuscriptisscientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Arethereferences sufficientandrecent?If you have suggestionofadditionalreferences,please mentioninthe review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart fromabove mentioned6 points, reviewersare freetoprovide additionalsuggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes,theyaresufficient</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u>REVISIONcomments</p> <p>1. Islanguage/Englishquality of the articlesuitableforscholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes,thelanguageis matchingtheskillsfescholarlycommunications.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u>comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Iprescribe thepapertobeacknowledgedonthe groundsthatthepaperisknowledgeable, elegantlycomposed,deliberateandallaroundmadesenseof.Thepaperhasnotdeviated from its centralthemeand istarget-oriented.The authorhas composedthepaperinsucha waythat itis easyforthereviewerandanyoneelseto understand. ➤ Thepaper'smainstrengthsare its: the way the paperwas written,how wellit was coordinated,howitusedtherightstatisticalanalysismethod,wherethecitationswentright, howthe contentwasupdated,andhowitwaswrittenin simpleEnglishwith good grammar. Thepaperis expressiveandsuccessful. ➤ As a result, the paper does not contain any flaws, but there is always room for improvement. ➤ Thetitleofthepaperis suitable. ➤ Thetheoreticaliscomposedunequivocallyandtothepointkeepinginviewthefurther satisfiedandsettingof thepaper. 	

ReviewForm 1.7

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:	Abhishek Sharma
Department, University & Country	Bareilly College, M.J.P. Rohilkhand University, India