

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJEBA_117853
Title of the Manuscript:	Industry 4.0 and Fayol's 14 Principles of Functional Management: Relevances, Emerging Practices and Consequences
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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>		
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The topic of the manuscript is very relevant and in line with the aims and scope of the journal which makes this manuscript interesting. However, I have some minor concerns that need to be addressed. I'll explain them in the order of importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Tables are structural forms with rows and columns. For this reason, shape and table separation should be done well. 2) The novel contribution of the manuscript shall be made clear in the introduction. What does the paper adds to international literature? 3) General statements shall be removed. 4) The adopted methodology shall be described. All methods used, assumptions made shall be justified. 5) Conclusions shall be specific and connected to your analysis of previous sections. 6) The English are very weak. There is a need for English Editing. 7) In my opinion, the policy recommendations do not have justification in the empirical results. 8) Please clearly highlight the literature gap this study tries to fill in. Let's write a selection from the current literature after 2021. 9)Let's revise the way of giving references according to the spelling rules of the journal. 10) And lastly, the writing needs to better. There are a plethora of run-on sentences and grammatical errors throughout. The writing issues sometimes make the paper difficult to read. Although there are not a lot of obvious mistakes, the style is clunky and I advise that the manuscript is proffered by a native English speaker. In general, the paper needs to be proofread and copy edited. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Disadvantage:</p> <p>✓ Having not enough images (for example table, figure, diagram, chart, graphic etc.) is a disadvantage for the paper.</p> <p>How to improve? :</p> <p>1- Those mentioned in the literature review can be tabulated. This makes it easier for the reader to understand.</p> <p>2- Overall, the abbreviations seem to be inconvenient since their notations were not explained when they first appear. Author(s) are suggested to revise the paper throughout.</p> <p>3- Overall, Author(s) are suggested to use more figure and table presentations which will help in understanding the whole picture of the study.</p> <p>4- Overall, more studies in the existing literature on the topic should have been cited/presented to make clear the contribution of the study. This will also help in showing how the study is going to fill the gap in the extant literature.</p> <p>5- Finally, the concluding in conjunction with the recommendations should address more specific outcomes of the contribution of the principles of division of labor, authority and responsibility, discipline, order, equity, and stability of tenure of personnel at the Henri Fayol's principles of management in the age of Industry 4.0.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Mustafa Göktuğ Kaya
Department, University & Country	KTO Karatay University, Turkey