

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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>(1)The manuscript will be of immense benefits to all the stakeholders of banking industry in India.</p> <p>(2) The title should read “An evaluation of Mobile Banking Revolution in India: A study of Behavioural Matrix Through UTAUT 2 Model” as against the present title form. This clearly indicates the independent variables and the dependent variable of the study/article.</p> <p>(3) Abstract of the article is okay.</p> <p>(4) The structure and subsections looks appropriate.</p> <p>(5) Yes, it is scientifically correct and relevant.</p> <p>(6) The references are of quality and sufficient as well as recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language/ English quality of the article is scholarly sound and suitable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>General Observations:</p> <p>The author needs to state clearly the specific objective of the paper and the statement of the problem/research gap which were lacking in the body of the paper.</p> <p>The theoretical background of the paper was muddled up with the empirical review whereas, for scholarly journals, theories provide the foundation for the research while empirical review outline its applications/adoptions in the industry in a bid to juxtapose and bring out their values to the system, even though, the theories were found to be relevant to the study. So, the author is advised to separate them i.e. theoretical background and empirical review</p> <p>Methodology okay with the minor corrections effected on them in the body of the paper by me.</p> <p>The author needs to summarise and be concise with the limitation & future scope of the paper as well as conclusion so as to manage effectively the space/resource and reduce the pages to be used by the entire paper drastically. For instance, the total pages can be reduced by one or two pages altogether.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tajudeen Tewogbola Lawal
Department, University & Country	Federal Polytechnic, National Open University of Nigeria, Nigeria