

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_105963
Title of the Manuscript:	PREDICTING SAVING INTENTION ON SYARIAH BANKING SERVICE USING DIGITALATIZATION AND BRAND TRUST AS DETERMINANT
Type of the Article	Data 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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes definitely, this study is useful for the banking industry and improving communication with customers.</p> <p>Yes, it is suitable. However, In my opinion, it is better to mention the case study item in the title.</p> <p>Yes, it is comprehensive. However, it is better to follow the abstract segmentation.</p> <p>Yes, they are appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, I think it is true, but must retest on another Samples.</p> <p>Yes, they are sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, I think language quality of the article is suitable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In my position, I would like to thank the researchers for their efforts. Please make the naming of variables/items in the conceptual model of Figure 1 and the structural model of Picture 1 the same (For Example Customer Interest and MINAT NASABAH). Figures and Pictures in naming should be considered the same.</p> <p>In the discussion section, it is necessary to analyse the issues by referring to similar researches, and there is a need for reliable references.</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:	Farzad Mirshamsi
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran