|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Book Name: | **Contemporary Issues in Business and Management** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_BPR\_3337.11** |
| Title of the Manuscript:  | **EXPLORING PROSPECTS AND IMPEDIMENTS: A QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF INDUSTRY EXPERTS TOWARDS ICT INTEGRATION BY MANUFACTURING SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES IN KWAZULU-NATAL, SOUTH AFRICA** |
| Type of the Article | **Book Chapter** |

|  |
| --- |
| 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 is significant for the scientific community because it addresses the specific challenges faced by manufacturing SMEs in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa, in adopting Information and Communication Technology (ICT). The qualitative insights from IT industry experts provide a fresh perspective on how SMEs can enhance their competitiveness through better integration of technology. I appreciate this study for its practical focus on solutions, such as creating advisory boards and government support programs, which are both innovative and actionable. However, a potential limitation is its reliance on a small sample size, which may affect the generalizability of its recommendations.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **Yes, it comply the Research Work.** |  |
| 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 is well-structured and provides a clear overview of the study's focus on ICT adoption challenges faced by South African manufacturing SMEs, specifically in KwaZulu-Natal. However, some adjustments could enhance clarity and strengthen the abstract:****Suggested Additions:**1. **Specify Key Findings on Barriers: Briefly mention the main barriers identified in the study, such as limited resources, lack of expertise, or resistance to change. This addition would give readers more insight into the exact challenges SMEs face with ICT integration.**
2. **Emphasize Practical Outcomes: You might add a phrase to highlight the practical value of the study's recommendations, focusing on the impact that advisory boards and government programs could have on SMEs' competitiveness and sustainability.**

**Suggested Deletions or Revisions:**1. **Simplify Language for Readability: Some phrases, such as "the ever-changing landscape of technology," could be more concise, e.g., "the rapid evolution of technology." This might improve readability.**
2. **Clarify the Sampling Method: Instead of "convenient sampling method," which could be ambiguous, consider specifying it as "purposive sampling," if that’s accurate, to better convey the rationale for selecting participants.**
 |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | **Yes, I do agree. Subsctions and structure of the manuscript appropriate.** |  |
| **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 presents a scientifically robust and technically sound study for several reasons. First, it addresses a clear research gap by focusing on the unique challenges and opportunities of ICT adoption among manufacturing SMEs in the underdeveloped region of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. The use of a qualitative, interpretive paradigm aligns well with the exploratory nature of this research, providing rich insights into the perspectives of IT specialists on ICT integration. Additionally, the study’s methodological rigor—interviewing IT professionals and using convenient sampling—supports the validity of the findings. The recommendations for creating advisory boards and government-assisted programs are logically derived from the findings, making this research both relevant and actionable.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | **References are appropriate and relevant.**  |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | English language meets level of a Research Scholar. NO ISSUE.  |  |
| Optional/General comments | Satisfied with the work. |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **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?**  | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Reviewer Details:** |
| Name: | **Mili Sumit Shah** |
| Department, University & Country | **Silver Oak University, India** |