

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_123772
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECT OF ELECTRONIC BANKING ON CUSTOMER SATISFACTION IN THE TANZANIAN BANKING INDUSTRY: CASE OF NMB BANK BRANCHES IN MOROGORO REGION
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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative 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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Abstract is needed to be reframed.</p> <p>Problem Statement: Proper rationale is missing</p> <p>Research Gaps: Research gaps are missing and it is not mentioned that which gaps will be filled by this study</p> <p>Contributions: This study lacks the contributions done by these author in terms of variables, methodology, theoretical contributions</p> <p>Hypothesis formulation: No hypotheses are mentioned, neither details of their acceptance and rejection</p> <p>Methodology: Links and adoption of questionnaire sources are missing</p> <p>Conclusion: Conclusions and discussion is weak. Studies results and the logical reasoning of results is missing</p> <p>Limitations: Limitations part is missing</p> <p>Future Directions: Future directions and gaps for future authors are also missing</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anam Toqeer</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of the Punjab, Pakistan</b>