

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_128282
Title of the Manuscript:	Reverse Logistics and Sustainability on Profitability: Exploring the Role of Data-Driven Decision Making – A Development of Conceptual Framework
Type of the Article	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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community by highlighting the link between reverse logistics, data driven decision making and organizational performance	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No.The title should read “ Review of the moderating role of data driven Decision making on the relationship between reverse logistics and firm performance”	
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.	No, the abstract should contain information on why thee is need for this study.I shoul highlight the gaps that this study needs to fill, the methodology used and the results should also be included in the abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript lacks a statement of the study which lead the reader to research objectives. The empirical literature is also not correctly reviewed as indicated on the manuscript. The empirical review should contain the names of the authors, year, the title of their study ,where the study was done, the methodology used, the study results and possibly recommendations. The study should also have methodology section showing the readers the method of data collection used , type of data analysis which was used.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Major corrections	

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:	Dan Andolo
Department, University & Country	Maseno University, Kenya