

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_86166
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY ON BRAND AWARENESS OF ELECTRIC TWO WHEELER IN COIMBATORE CITY
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### **General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>In the Abstract, generally speaking, its structure commonly is made up of “background, purpose, method, result, conclusion, and value section”.so the authors should rewrite it.</p> <p>In the Introduction, the materials of the paper shown should be just up-date to 2022, and the authors also can look through the recent and important paper on this topic again, specially during the year of 2019-2022.</p> <p>In the Theoretical Background and research Hypotheses, we should link to the recent and most literature, specially 2019-2022. Besides, we also pay more attention to the value and contribution of the paper.</p> <p>In the Methodology section, the authors should describe more details about how to investigate. The authors should tell the readers why they use the method. How to conduct ? and so on.</p> <p>In the Discussion section, the authors should explain results, derive specific theoretical, practical implications, and describe limitations. So the authors should supply more.</p> <p>In the Conclusion and recommendations section, the paper should make a theoretical or practical or methodological contribution. They should be divided into two parts, I suggest that.</p> <p>In the References section, we should strictly conduct as APA style. And their DOIs should be added. Besides, it is lack of the recent and important ones, specially the year of 2019-2022.</p> <p>Overall, the language of the paper is not up to the standard. Though English grammar is not one of my strongest skills, however, at the times its hard for me to understand the meaning to the sentences. I suggest to critically review you manuscript for grammar and sentence structure accurateness, so that reader can understand the meaning of the arguments developed.</p> <p>Based on the contribution and value of the Manuscript, I must choose Major Revision. The authors must make necessary and major revision, if the manuscript can be accepted, its contribution should be sufficient for publication.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Bei Lyu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Huaibei Normal University, China</b>