

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_125855
Title of the Manuscript:	Integrating ICT for Enhanced Maize Market Access: A Business Model for Storage and e-Marketing in Char Land
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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The manuscript is a long and boring one, though it has a vital information, its none quantitative nature and long stories needs to be cut short with some data facts The format of the conceptual frame work should be looked into. More diagrammatic expressions should be included SEE ATTACHMENT	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title could be adjusted slightly when the required changes are made	
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 should be adjusted when the required change(s) is/are made	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	This manuscript is robust but the manner in which it argues is boring. The manuscript can be better by bringing in diagrams through facts and figures. What referencing style is being used? With few adjustments, the paper would be more scientific	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The referencing style is not understood. The APA style has year included but some of the references have no year included hence, it is difficult to conclude if they are recent.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the English/Language is suitable for Scholarly communication	
Optional/General comments	The author should be further encouraged to publish more good articles	

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:	Maryanne Odufa Egbeadumah
Department, University & Country	Federal University Wukari, Nigeria