

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJEBA_114308</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Influence of Organizational Culture, Alliance Partners, Digital Capability on Firm Performance Mediated by Strategy Flexibility</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Journal 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>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, the approach conforms to the structure of academic paper. The author(s) meticulously chose a topic that furthers the knowledge of the area by considering other influencing variables not attended to by previous authors.</p> <p>Yes, the title is appropriate.</p> <p>It is good but the author(s) must include their recommendations/add the study's impact on the industry. Yes, it is properly done.</p> <p>Yes, but the author(s) need to make some corrections.</p> <p>References are adequate but mostly not current. It is hard to identify the referencing style the author(s) use. They are advised to read the Journal's prescribed referencing style and follow the same.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>English is good.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The author(s) did a good job but the paper needs some revision. Principally, the author(s) must contextualize the discussion section of the paper. Other useful comments are indicated in the call-outs of the reviewers working sheet. This is attached for the author(s) attention. References: Which REFERENCING STYLE are you using: MLA, APA, CHICAGO, HARVARD, VANCOUVER? THE References did not comply with any of these!</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kwami H Quao</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Wenzhou-Kean University, China</b>