



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_39814
Title of the Manuscript:	ELECTRONIC MARKETING AND ITS EFFECT ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE (A STUDY OF SELECTED FIVE MANUFACTURING COMPANIES IN OYO STATE, NIGERIA)
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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>The study is suggested to incorporate the updated literature (2016 and 2017 studies) into Introduction section.</p> <p>Line 81 – 83: The study needs to explain why it selected manufacturing companies in Oyo State, Nigeria.</p> <p>Literature Review section of the study needs to be re-organised, emphasising the empirical gap/s identified.</p> <p>Methodology: The main objective of the study is to examine the effect of e-marketing on organization performance. Then, the study design should be explanatory (cause and effect). Explain who are the respondents (managers, owners ...) It is required to revise the Data Collection Instruments section. This section needs to explain the operationalization of e-marketing and organizational performance using literature support. Explain how this study identified the daunting factors preventing adoption of e-marketing.</p> <p>The result in Table 4 is completely confused the reader. How this study measures mean values? On what basis, the study accepted the given statement?</p> <p>The study is strongly suggested to revise the Conclusion section.</p> <p>The study needs to provide explanation on how it suggested the recommendations.</p>	All the corrections we felt are necessary have been effected.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Rephrase the following terms in research objectives: Line 84: impact – effect Line 86: influence – effect</p> <p>Line 82: In the main objective, the study mentioned as manufacturing companies, but in specific objectives, they mentioned as business organizations.</p> <p>Line 93 – 95: Hypotheses need to be completed as E-Marketing has no significant impact on effective decision making in business organizations in Oyo State, Nigeria</p> <p>Line 264: what is the meaning of 'wax stronger'?</p> <p>Line 284: Different font type</p> <p>Line 288: Sakes value?</p>	I believe different authors with different views. There is no way we can have convergent views on the universal pattern of writing papers. Using “effect” throughout may not be appropriate or acceptable by another researcher, since the general objective is to examine the effect, other specific objectives may not necessarily be “effect” but influence, relationship, impact, etc..
Optional/General comments		