

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> Ans: Yes. If Author(s) can add applications, advantages and disadvantages as separate section that would be great.</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> Ans: Looks good to me.</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> Ans: Yes.</p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> Ans: Yes.</p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> Ans: Yes.</p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form</b> Ans: Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Overall article is good. Few are suggestion(s) to the Author(s):</p> <p>1. Author(s) may want to tag references instead of using Author's name and year.</p> <p>2. Author(s) may want to use numbering for the references.</p> <p>3. Author(s) want to remove hyperlinks from the references; some have hyperlinks and some don't.</p> <p>Author(s) may want to maintain consistency and use standard format for references such as APA or IEEE</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Manu Mitra</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Bridgeport, USA</b>