

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_126282
Title of the Manuscript:	The Moderating Influence of Enterprise Resource Planning on the Relationship Between Electronic Order Processing and Supply Chain Performance of manufacturing Firms in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This manuscript's original research technique, which offers fresh insights and analytical tools in the field of supply chain management, particularly regressions and correlations is what makes it significant to the scientific community. This manuscript well aligns with the current models of scientific research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I'm satisfied with the title.	
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.	I suggest that a mention of the results of descriptive statistics be made in one sentence.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	All subsections, tables and figures are well structured and labelled.	
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.	Because of its exacting approach, thorough data analysis as reviewed, and adherence to accepted scientific norms, this manuscript is both technically and scientifically all-encompassing. The study is based on a well-defined model with clear objective, and a comprehensive literature review. Robust statistical methods used can guarantee that results are impartial, accurate, and dependable; they are in-depth in analysis with evidence of rigour.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are recent and sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments	The language is academic and suitable for scholarly communications	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Omai Moindi Kevin
Department, University & Country	Kenya