

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_126155
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of Big Data in Accounting information systems; Accountant's functions
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article in general is very good. The theme is current and very interesting. It has an extensive literature review and empirical testing. There are some minor form issues to review.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	One of the main things to check is the title. It is not okay for the title to have a semicolon. I suggest another one that says "the relationships between big data and counter functions" or eliminate what is after the semicolon.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, it is	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are. Check that there are two numbered sections under the heading 3.Methodology	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article has the structure and content of a scientific article. It has an introduction where the research question is clear, then a complete literary review, an empirical test and finally a conclusion.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, they are	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, it is	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Review title and duplication of section 3.Methodology	

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:	Eliana Mariela Werbin
Department, University & Country	National University of Cordoba, Argentina