

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_110720</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Live Streaming Shopping Investigation: The Role Perceived Enjoyment In Impulsive Buying</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>This topic is important for the scientific community since it discusses the latest issues or concerns in the marketing field. However, the elements of good writing must be followed as commented below.</b></p> <p>2. <b>The title is suitable.</b></p> <p>3. <b>The abstract should be improved. I believe that the study is meant to test the model based on the previous work. Therefore, the sim of the paper should be changed. The study design and methodology need further elaboration.</b></p> <p>4. <b>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are acceptable, but the content needs to be reorganized to create a proper flow.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</b></p> <p>6. <b>The references are sufficient and recent, but they are not according to the right format.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. The language quality is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. Impulse buying as the dependent variable should be defined and discussed at the beginning of the manuscript, in the introduction section, and the literature review section.</p> <p>2. The research problem and gap should be adequately discussed in the introduction section of the paper so that readers are clear on why this research was undertaken.</p> <p>3. In the literature review part, start with the discussion on the DV, followed by the discussion on the model or theory used, the IVs, and the mediator.</p> <p>4. The discussion on the link between cheerfulness and perceived enjoyment is quite misleading to support the hypotheses on the connection between playfulness and perceived enjoyment. The spelling of playfulness should be consistent; not with a double "L" and different terms "cheerful, playfully (as in the framework)".</p> <p>5. The reference format is not consistent from one reference to another.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<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>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>Abdul Kadir Othman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Business Excellence, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia</b>