

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_100043
Title of the Manuscript:	Influencing Factors in Binimoy Acceptance and Use: A SEM Approach
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)
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)	Overall, this manuscript presents innovative ideas clearly and effectively. The structure is well-organized, and the writing is clear and concise. The author has done an excellent job of explaining a complex technical process in an easy-to-understand way. However, to improve the manuscript, the author should ensure that the references cited in the introduction and related work section are thoroughly addressed in the reference section. Additionally, the introduction should provide an extended version of the abstract, with elaboration on the key points and supportive ideas and references. Lastly, the conclusion section needs revision to provide a more insightful and comprehensive summary of the manuscript. Finally, the author should ensure that all references are properly formatted according to the relevant rules.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Maad M. Mijwil
Department, University & Country	Baghdad College of Economic Sciences University, Iraq