

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_112910
Title of the Manuscript:	Unleashing the Potential: A Mixed Methods Study on Assessing Digital Marketing Adoption in Indian SMEs
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The article I read is a partially original work. Because when the literature on digital marketing was scanned, it was determined that the number of studies directly aimed at Indian SMEs was limited. Therefore, it is thought that this research differs from other studies.</p> <p>2. The title of the research is suitable but it can be suggested as: A Mixed Methods study to uncover the Adoption potential of Digital Marketing in Indian SMEs</p> <p>3. The summary is comprehensive, but the population and sample are not specified. Keywords are in appropriate number. The subject is suitable. It suits the title.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the article are appropriate. Concepts have been defined. Dimensions are given. The literature review is written as a passive transfer.</p> <p>5. Your article is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. References are not sufficient and up to date.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scientific communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The literature review could be more comprehensive. Additionally, when multiple citations are made in the text, the order can be made from past to present. • References are not given properly. • In the literature, current data can be written by taking the number of social media users in India from we are social. • It may be more accurate to use the words goods and services instead of product and service. • In the conclusion, important findings are not discussed in the context of theoretical implications with existing theory and literature. 	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Kader
Department, University & Country	Mersin University, Türkiye