

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_SAJ SSE_86493 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Problems, Common Beliefs and Procedures on the Use of Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling in Business Research |
| 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.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

| | 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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <p>I cannot figure out if the author is producing anything novel. Did the authors produce Figures 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5? If not, provide references. Furthermore, in Tables 4 through 11, did these authors produce all of these results, or are the authors showing work performed by others in the literature? The authors need to clearly state what is their own work and how they generated their results, or the authors need to provide clear references, especially regarding the figures and tables.</p> <p>Are the authors simply using results in the literature to compare PLS-SEM with CB-SEM, or are the authors introducing new results based on their own novel research?</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>On p. 2, line 5: Remove the period after the word "concepts."</p> <p>On p. 3, middle: The statement "In contrast to CB-SEM, where the method used is a common factor" is not a complete sentence.</p> <p>On p. 4, line 7: The statement "in a data" should be replaced with "in a dataset."</p> <p>On p. 5, line -5: The statement "It is still too early" is confusing. WHAT is "still too early"?</p> <p>On p. 7, third paragraph: Why is "the decision ... not allowed"?</p> <p>On p. 15, above Table 11: A researcher can fail to reject the null hypothesis, but a researcher should not "accept the null hypothesis (H0)."</p> <p>On p. 17, middle: The authors write, "If you are a good researcher, you ..." The paper should not be written in second-person.</p> | |
| Optional/General comments | Overall, the paper is well-written. | |

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: | Steven T. Garren |
| Department, University & Country | James Madison University, USA |