

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_105654
Title of the Manuscript:	MOBILE BANKING REVOLUTION IN INDIA: A STUDY OF BEHAVIOURAL MATRIX THROUGH UTAUT2 MODEL
Type of the 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.journalajebea.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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This manuscript is important to add to the development of knowledge and can be used as a reference.</li> <li>2. The title is in accordance with the purpose of the research and its presentation.</li> <li>3. An already comprehensive abstract contains: objectives, methodology, results and conclusions, it is necessary to add recommendations.</li> <li>4. The structure of the article is appropriate and interrelated between its parts.</li> <li>5. This manuscript looks original and scientifically correct.</li> <li>6. References are updated and sufficient. But it needs to be checked again because there are some inconsistencies between citations and references.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	The English used is already suitable for scientific communication.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The consistency between the title, content and conclusion is good. Please check the typo of the entire article.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hedwigis Esti Riwayati</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Perbanas Institute, Indonesia</b>