

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_96771
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Visual Merchandising on Consumers' Impulsive Buying Behaviour: Reference to Apparel Retail Stores in Sri Lanka
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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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)
<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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript brings important contributions to help apparel retail stores managers in making decisions regarding visual merchandising and consumer behavior. The chosen framework (S-O-R) seems to be aligned with the manuscript aims. The findings answer the research question. As theoretical contribution, the manuscript reinforces the validity of S-O-R in consumer behavior studies.</p> <p>2. The title represents the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate, following a convenient logic sequence.</p> <p>5. The manuscript adopted sufficient theoretical background to create the proposed model's variables. The validity and reliability of the measures were assessed with convenient criteria. The proposed model presented high determination coefficient (41%) and significant precedents of the Consumers' Impulsive Buying Behaviour. The authors included the limitations of the study, which is very important to guide the replication of this study in another context. I consider the manuscript scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I detected are only two spelling problems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the abstract, it is necessary to correct the word "phenomenons". The plural of phenomenon is phenomena. - In table 1, in the third measurement item of the compulsive buying behaviour, it is necessary to correct the word "behavoiur" 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article presents a consistent discussion, with a good articulation between results and arguments of the authors of the referential background.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Agnaldo Keiti Higuchi
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal dos Vales do Jequitinhonha e Mucuri, Brazil