

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJEB_A_112910</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Unleashing the Potential: A Mixed Methods Study on Assessing Digital Marketing Adoption in Indian SMEs</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The manuscript has an interesting and up-to-date topic, providing useful knowledge to enhance the literature, particularly in the digital marketing study in India. It also provides additional evidence and support to the SMEs' digital marketing research.</li> <li>The title is precise, making it easy to understand what the research is all about, and sounds exciting. However, the author can try to omit "the mixed method" to shorten it, for example, "The Current Situation of Indian SMEs' Digital Marketing Adoption."</li> <li>The abstract is comprehensive but quite wordy and overly long, so it would be better to shorten it, making it more precise.</li> <li>The overall structure is adequate. Some sections are missing, for example, hypothesis development and the measurements of the quantitative study. Also, the discussions and study's contributions and implications should be set as subsections.</li> <li>Some details should be added to the research methodology, such as the criteria and standards for conducting quality focus group discussion with references in the qualitative phase, the number of the population of interest, and the criteria and the sampling method used in selecting the sample group in the quantitative phase. In addition, the data quality tests, such as validity and reliability, should also be added.</li> <li>Additional references should be added, particularly in the discussion part, that should also be aligned with the literature review and should be recent especially the related prior research. Some in the literature review are not up to date enough.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	A grammar check would be beneficial.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Since it is a mixed method, the link between the two methods should also be beneficial.	

**PART 2:**

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Akaraphun Ratasuk</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Panyapiwat Institute of Management, Thailand</b>