

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_124298
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Effect of Decision Support System on Strategic Business decisions: Insight from Selected Manufacturing Companies in Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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.	This manuscript addresses a relevant issue in modern business operations, particularly for manufacturing companies in developing countries. It explores the impact of decision support systems (DSS) on strategic business decision-making, offering insights that can help firms improve efficiency and competitiveness. The findings are important for the scientific community because they provide empirical evidence from the Nigerian context.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is generally suitable as it reflects the content and scope of the study. However, to enhance specificity, the title could be revised for example: "The Effect of Decision Support Systems on Strategic Business Decisions: Evidence from Manufacturing Companies in Nigeria."	
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.	The abstract provides a good overview of the study, including its objectives, methods, and key findings. However, it could be improved by including more specific details about the research methodology (e.g., sample size, statistical techniques used). Additionally, the practical implications of the findings should be highlighted more clearly in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate and logically organized. Each section builds on the previous one, guiding the reader through the research problem, methodology, and results effectively.	
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 manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The use of stratified random sampling and regression analysis demonstrates a methodologically rigorous approach. The research questions are well-defined, and the data analysis is thorough, leading to meaningful and actionable conclusions. However, the statistical analysis could be enhanced with more detailed explanations of regression results and a deeper exploration of the types of DSS tools evaluated.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient. Including studies from the last five years would strengthen the literature review and position the study within contemporary research trends.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but a few areas could be improved for clarity and readability. Minor grammatical revisions and clearer sentence structures would enhance the manuscript's quality.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Manoj Kumar Vandanapu
Department, University & Country	USA