

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_114108
Title of the Manuscript:	CHALLENGES IN DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION OF MICROENTERPRISES IN NUEVA ECIJA: A BASIS FOR RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN.
Type of the Article	

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>

Review Form 1.7

<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.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No. The abstract needs to highlight the population/sample size. A summary of the major results should be included in the abstract. Importantly, the manuscript is about microenterprises. Yet the abstract does not seem to be about microenterprises.</p> <p>The researchers numbered only 4 sections of the manuscript. Then the researchers had this heading, 'Challenges of Digital Transformation', and followed up this heading with headings that discussed different types of challenges faced by the microenterprises. These headings could read better if they were subheadings of 'Challenges of Digital Transformation'. Therefore, the structure needs to be revisited to distinguish headings from subheadings.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The references are recent but insufficient. The researchers subdivided the literature study into 2 areas namely, related foreign studies and Philippine related studies. About two-thirds of the related foreign studies needs referencing. This was the top part of the related foreign studies. Most of the Philippine related studies need referencing from the Philippine government even specific Philippine government departments. For instance, the researchers write about and cite from the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Development Plan 2017-2022 without acknowledging the government of Philippine or the responsible government department. The researchers are encouraged to revisit the literature study, both parts thereof, and correct the referencing issues.</p> <p>When the same source that published more than once in the same year is cited, the expectation is to add an alphabetical letter to the publication year to distinguish the articles cited. There were 2 citations of Smith (2018) without specifying which article/source/publication the researchers cited. This needs to be fixed. Suggestion, the citation to one publication can be Smith (2018a) and the other publication can be Smith (2018b).</p> <p>The standard practise is to use '<i>et al.</i>' for intext citations and write out the authors' last names and initials in the list of references. This standard was, however, disregarded.</p> <p>When 'retrieved from...' is included in the list of references, the standard practise is to include the retrieval date as well.</p> <p>The topic is about microenterprises. Yet, the related foreign studies focus on SMEs. This departure needs to be clarified.</p> <p>The researchers use these nouns interchangeably, enterprise, organization, business, company, and SMEs. This is inconsistent. These nouns are different particularly when size matters. The manuscript merely discusses the results but does not highlight even summarize the major results. Summarizing the major results would add value to the manuscript since the conclusion and recommendation focus on the challenges of digital transformation.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Some paragraphs are unnecessarily longer while others are shorter. May the researchers please strike a balance here?</p> <p>While the language may be appropriate, there were some grammatical issues that were picked up. Here is one issue picked up from the manuscript, 'This means that the success of digital transformation requires knowledge on how to integrate, capability and resources to make the</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>necessary transformation with the goal of improving the products, the process, people and the company with the use of digital technology. (Pantic, et.al , 2019)'. The highlighted part does not make sense unless the comma is removed. This same sentence appears twice in the same paragraph. What value does the repetition add to the content? The researchers finally need to investigate paragraph alignment inconsistencies. At one point, the paragraphs are justified. At another point, the paragraphs are aligned left.</p>	
Optional/General comments	Best bet, language-edit the manuscript.	

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:	Cecil Kgoetiane
Department, University & Country	Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa