

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_117332
Title of the Manuscript:	Market Orientation and Firm Performance on Department Stores
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.journalajebea.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>The topic related to performance determinants and especially market orientation is of interest to both entrepreneurs and the scientific community. Perhaps it would be appropriate for the authors to formulate a section dedicated to the introduction in the first part of the article. Here it would be important to refer to the identification of the gap in the specialised literature, the aim of the article. Reference can also be made to the methodology used, to the scientific contribution of the research, and the usefulness of the results. The final paragraph could make a brief reference to the structure of the article.</p> <p>I encourage the authors to rename the section entitled "Background of the study" as "Literature review". It is important that a concentration of a representative number of bibliographic titles is made here to enrich this section. The specialized literature considered for the creation of the article is sufficiently developed, it is representative and up to date. It would be important that bibliographic references are made to a significant extent in this section.</p> <p>I don't think it is appropriate to fragment the content of the article by the distinct name of some small paragraphs or by enumerations in a schematic form (as was done, for example, in "Statement of the problem", "Significance of the study", "Summary of findings", "Conclusions" and "Recommendations"). The flowing formulation of ideas is important, and they should be harmoniously linked to each other to give the article a unified aspect.</p> <p>"The research design" and "Results and discussion" are very well documented. I encourage the authors to try to synthesise the information in this section to a greater extent to more effectively manage the space allocated to the research. The article should contain the essential information to a smaller extent (in a smaller number of pages). The substantiation of the research results is ensured very well by comparing the results obtained with those of other studies carried out in the field.</p> <p>I hope that the formulated proposals will be useful and that the authors will be able to consider the suggestions put forward, which will lead to an increase in the quality of the article, to an increase in the degree of interest in the research results, and implicitly to an increase in the visibility of the journal.</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>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

[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:	Berinde Sorin-Romulus
Department, University & Country	"Babeş-Bolyai" University, Romania