



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>I think that the paper needs further revision.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Particularly, I see that the Materials and Methods section is now missing. The author should clearly explain the methodology and demonstrate how it differs from the previous approaches (the author's contribution and novelty). 2. The results must be presented in line with the research gaps and the aims of the study. 3. A summary of the findings in a form of a table or a figure would be helpful. 4. The findings must be discussed through the lens of previous studies to show the similarities and differences, i.e., to highlight the contribution of the study to the literature and policy, along with potential implications of the study. 	<p>1. Basically, this is a review paper specifically in reference price effects (an integrative literature overview and frame a 3-category taxonomy). Therefore, the method we used is literature review.</p> <p>For Q2, 3 & 4: The review paper is intended to provide a new direction for future research using this new integrative framework of 3-category taxonomy that might provide a better way to understand how consumers perceive different reference price cues and impact on their purchase behaviours.</p> <p>As a result, this review paper is unable to provide a summary of findings (any data) in a table or figure. This review article does have theoretical contributions that we mentioned in the conclusion section. However, we don't have evidence to support any practical implications.</p> <p>Overall, thank you for your valuable comments.</p>