

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_96798
Title of the Manuscript:	Antecedents of Online Purchasing Intentions for Skintific Skincare Brand on the Social Commerce Platform
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.journalajebo.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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1- The manuscript includes a research based on a valid scientific topic. 2- The title seems to be suitable. 3- The abstract should be rewritten. It should be in the form of an essay rather than a bulleted text. And it should give the essence of the manuscript; the aim, the result and the importance of the topic that was researched. 4- The structure of the manuscript seems to be appropriate. However the introduction part should be re-organized and separated to include a literature review part. 5- The manuscript includes is structured to include research and literature review and hence seems scientifically correct. 6- The references seem to be sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are some grammatical errors and mistakes, the manuscript should be spell-checked and reviewed in terms of grammar rules.	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nilay Sahin
Department, University & Country	Türkiye