

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <b>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</b>                          |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_JEMT_105399</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>IT ALIGNMENT AND PERFORMANCE: A STUDY IN UAE EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS</b> |
| 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.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/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><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(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><b>Yes, taken as a case study</b></p> <p><b>Yes, it is</b></p> <p><b>It stands up to expectations</b></p> <p><b>Yes they are. However, Fig. 5 is missing from text</b></p> <p><b>It keeps the standards. However, needs further improvement as indicated</b></p> <p><b>They are to my knowledge</b></p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | <p>Yes they are. It can also be applied to administration staff</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>With further elaboration, it can be used as an indicator and tool for IT institutional organization and improvements</p>  |   |

### 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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> |   |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Evangelos Vergos</b>                               |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Perrotis College, American Farm School, Greece</b> |