

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_109329
Title of the Manuscript:	A Cashless Society: Consumer Perception Towards the Use of Digital Transactions
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes. Bhutanese payment systems have evolved from currency notes and coins first issued in 1974 to the increasingly cashless and paperless payment systems of the digital era, and significant progress has been achieved mainly in the electronic payment (e-payment) infrastructure in Bhutan.</p> <p>2. OK</p> <p>3. Poorly describe the objective of the study, the research design, the main findings, and the contribution.</p> <p>4. Subsections are OK</p> <p>5. OK but a lot of room for improvement</p> <p>6. The author did not demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature and Did not cite an appropriate range of literature sources</p> <p>7. No argument was built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or idea. No appropriate methods are employed. The study also did not justify the technique (s) used in the study. The methodology part should be improved.</p> <p>8. The study did not provide thoroughness of the discussion to reaffirm the importance of the study and provide a clear picture of the study, which supported by the overall findings</p> <p>9. Implications for research, practice and/or society were not clearly identified</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Too many grammatical errors throughout the manuscript</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 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:	Ainon Ramli
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Kelantan, Malaysia