

Review Form 1.7

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

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes this Manuscript is important for scientific community but need to make lots of changes before publishing this paper</p> <p>2. No, title is not suitable</p> <p>Live Streaming Shopping Investigation through Tiktok: The Role Perceived Enjoyment In Impulsive Buying</p> <p>3. No, abstract is not talking about problem statement and probable of final outcome of the study based on problem statement</p> <p>4 Research methodology is not done properly</p> <p>5.No, Needs lots of changes in it</p> <p>6. Yes references are OK</p> <p>7. 1. Title is not having any brand/product/industry so what type of impulsive buying will happen that is missing 7. 2. introduction section is not having much information about evolutionary and contemporary studies 7. 3. Research gap is missing in literature review 7. 4. There are hypothesis but Objectives are missing in research paper 7. 5. Conceptual framework is given but it is not justified by data analysis 7. 6. Researcher have applied Structural Equation Model but Model is not given in the study 7. 7. In Structural Equation Model there are five types of goodness of fit, and all are missing 7. 8. Hypothesis testing is done on the basis of Structural Equation Model, whereas researcher could have applied some parametric or non-parametric tests in in to test the hypothesis 7.9. Conclusion is totally wrong 7.10 Recommendation section does not have any recommendation</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	This paper could be accepted after major changes	

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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ganesh Waghmare
Department, University & Country	MIT College of Management, MIT Art, Design and Technology University, India