

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 (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>Yes indeed. It is important for organizations to pay attention to management in this fast paced evolving use of digital technologies. Organizations shouldn't lose focus but they need to improve their management skills to fit into 4IR.</p> <p>Critical analysis of the relevance of Fayol's 14 management principles in the 4th Industrial Revolution: Relevance, Emerging Practices and Consequences.</p> <p>The abstract is detailed and provides the insides about what is covered within the research.</p> <p>They are but I feel that there is too much repetition of information within the manuscript. Information that is in the literature is repeated in the tables included.</p> <p>Yes, I agree.</p> <p>They are.</p> <p>I am worried about repetition of information in the manuscript. Maybe the authors can present it in a different manner than repeating it as it is in the literature, especially in the tables.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English is fine but I would advise the authors not to keep repeating what they said in other parts of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall this is a very interesting write and the authors have done an excellent job.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tefo Gordon Sekgweleo
Department, University & Country	South Africa