

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_101089
Title of the Manuscript:	The Knowledge and Accuracy Roles in Explaining the Business Communication on Customer Satisfaction inside SMEs
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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>As general, the manuscript's research was able to explain how SMEs were impacted by the business communication and customer satisfaction. This is show how important this research to the SMEs community to capture on the perspective of customer.</p> <p>Title is sufficient to reflect the idea of research.</p> <p>Abstract need to be include aims of the manuscript's research.</p> <p>In term of structure is sufficient and acceptable. However, please section 1.3 did not have in the manuscript.</p> <p>Please restructure section 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 into one main chapter under LITERATURE REVIEW section.</p> <p>Manuscript's content is sufficient.</p> <p>List of references in the manuscript is acceptable with up-to-date/latest references within 5 years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language of English used throughout the manuscript is acceptable. However, if the manuscript did not yet go to English professional proof-reader, please get one first before the final manuscript to be publish.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>NA</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohamad Fadhli Bin Rashid
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia