

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_95395
Title of the Manuscript:	Examining the Influences of Short Video for Cosmetics on Consumer Purchase Intention
Type of the Article	Empirical

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.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Based on the details given in 1.3 Research Contribution and Section 5, this study failed to provide any theoretical contributions. It focuses solely on the practitioners.</p> <p>2. Title is incomplete. There should be an indication of the respondents.</p> <p>3. Abstract is fairly complete.</p> <p>4. Research Background should be renamed as 1.1 Problem Statement. Remove the heading of 1.1 Introduction. Remove section 2.9 hypotheses as the individual hypothesis is already embedded in the earlier sections. Section 6 Conclusion should be the last excerpt of this manuscript.</p> <p>5. The model is a simple model without third-party variables. I also noted that the questionnaire design heavily relied on past literature. I wonder why the author needs to run the EFA in this context. Additionally, the author did not display the result of CFA which raises my concerns on the key statistical values e.g. R-square, significance value etc.</p> <p>6. In-text citations are not complete (i.e. no year/ author name). For example, iResearch and Euromonitor statements in the last two paragraphs of Section 1.1.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	There should be a major improvement in the language quality.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	No (clear) details on the target respondents and theories referred.	

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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gengeswari Krishnapillai
Department, University & Country	Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Malaysia