

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_104360
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Perceived Risk on Consumer's Online Purchase Intention at Zalora for Muslim Clothing Product
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.journalajebea.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Scientifically the manuscript is correct, but it suffers from such limitations. For example, we can note that at the level of the literature review section; the section 2.1 Theory Of Perceived Risk must be followed by the subsections relative to perceived risk dimensions (financial, social, product, security, time and psychological risks) and not by the section relative to intention. Absence of a section relative to research hypotheses' demonstration: the author is limited to just stating hypotheses from H1 to H6. The author has to evoke contributions and managerial implications at the level of the conclusion.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ines Soltani
Department, University & Country	University of Sousse, Tunisia