

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_103967
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Ceramic Sales on the Performance of Ceramic Craftsmen in Malang with Digitalization as a Moderation Variable
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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. A Good research which follows a systematic, appropriate research methodology are very important for scientific community. This research follows the quantitative research methodology where Sampling was carried out using a saturated sampling technique, and used SPSS 21 software. The questionnaires distributed were measured using a Likert scale. So this manuscript is important for scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes, The title "The Effect of Ceramic Sales on the Performance of Ceramic Craftsmen in Malang with Digitalization as a Moderation Variable" of this article is suitable according the modern trend and follows the content of the manuscript. It is satisfactorily follows the content.</p> <p>3. The Abstract is crisp and short and provide the summary of whole research work i.e. aim, design, methodology, result interpretation etc.</p> <p>4. The researcher has done a great work and produce this great work in a systematic and structured format which has to be followed in a good research work. The work is in the systematic order i.e. introduction, hypothesis building, research methodology to carry out this research, result and interpretation.</p> <p>5. Yes, the research work is scientifically correct. This researcher has used relevant and empirical data and provide proper data analysis. This research follows the FINER criteria which is feasible, interesting, novel, ethical and relevant.</p> <p>6. The reference is sufficient and recent. The researcher properly acknowledged the previous research work.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	English quality of the research work is satisfactorily.	
<p>Optional/General 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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pankaj Kumar Bharti
Department, University & Country	Meerut College, India