

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_128604
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Impact of Islamic Finance Principles on Micro and Small Enterprise Performance: A Systematic Review
Type of the Article	Review 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>

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.	The paper addresses a vital topic "Impact of Islamic Finance Principles on Micro and Small Enterprise Performance".	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suitable. However, I can be revised: Exploring the Impact of Islamic Finance Principles on Micro and Small Enterprise Performance: A Systematic Review In the methodology, you need to mention it is Traditional Review/General Review <ul style="list-style-type: none">Systematic reviews are an evidence-based method that employs precise and explicit methods to minimize bias and enhance the reliability of conclusions.	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The methodological approach is not presented in the abstract.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>1. No,</p> <p>2. The authors mentioned that this manuscript is a systematic review, but they do not clearly state the process; there is no effective identification, screening, or exclusion.</p> <p>3. Authors stated the following: “<i>Keywords and Boolean operators, ‘Islamic finance’ AND ‘micro and small enterprises’ OR MSEs OR SMEs to find Islamic financial principles AND business performance.</i>” These terms and keywords should produce more articles and documents. So, what is the total number of identified papers, screened, excluded, and included documents for the benefit of the present study? A systematic review should have a sample (included documents).</p> <p>4. The timeframe used in this study is “2010 and 2024.” So, the authors used review documents, claiming their focus on contemporary and global context. However, since their work is not limited to any specific area, authors were supposed to review enough papers published in this period.</p> <p>5. Why were Uganda, Oman, Indonesia, and Nigeria specifically selected for this study? What criteria were used to determine their inclusion?</p> <p>NB. To successfully publish a systematic review paper, authors must adhere to all relevant guidelines and requirements.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>No. there are some problems in this section.</p> <p>1. references are very small, only 15 sources,</p> <p>2. some references are duplicate such as: Akbar T, Siti-Nabiha AK (2022).</p> <p>3. In-text citations and list of references are not matching.</p> <p>4. different referring styles are applied.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Good</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In “introduction” you stated:</p> <p>With the use of a mixed-method approach and a clear address to previous studies' methodological weaknesses, the aim of the study is to provide an in-depth understanding of the relationship between Islamic finance and performance of micro and small enterprises.</p> <p>1. what do you mean “mixed-method approach”?</p> <p>2. Could you perhaps explain how it was applied in this study?</p> <p>Other points:</p> <p>1. Given that your study is a review, please elaborate on how you will correlate the identified gaps in previous research with your own analysis. How will your review contribute to filling these gaps?</p> <p>2. What are the key findings of this review? Not clear</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Dayah Abdi Kulmie</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Jamhuriya University of Science and Technology, Somalia</p>