

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_126774
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of “Smart City” Pilot Construction on China’s Export Product Quality
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important to the scientific community as it dealt with issues of the impact of "Smart City" Pilot Construction on China's Export Product Quality	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is not comprehensive enough. It should also include a bit of info on experiment conducted, summary of the finding and its implications.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of the manuscript are not enough. the author should contact the journal format	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Scientifically, this manuscript is correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and current	
Minor REVISION comments	The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the paper showed that a lot has been omitted. this general comments are based on the current material. - I suggest the reseach problem should be well developed with research questions and hypotheses. - the model was well veveloped but the experiments and analysis should have a corresponding materials in the methodology. - I also, suggest review of literature inserted in the paper. - Do findings of this paper corroborated with other works? - This should show at the discussion section which should be inserted.. 	

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:	Emmanuel D K Havi
Department, University & Country	Methodist University Ghana, Ghana