

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_96847</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Moderating Role of Point-of-Purchase Price Information in Consumers' Price Perception and Purchase Intention</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### 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> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The research results are still not useful for the community because the area, number of samples, methods, results and implications are not clearly stated.</p> <p>The title is still unclear, avoid using "purchase" repeatedly.</p> <p>The abstract must contain clearly the research objectives, the methods used, the results and implications. Keywords are too long, use simpler words. The method and interpretation of the results section is still not in-depth. Exploration of the available articles is needed. This article is still in the major revision category and requires in-depth discussion.</p> <p>The majority of references are too old, the latest articles are needed, at most the last 10 years</p> <p><b>Authors can add images of models that are built, not just in the form of narration.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Note the use of words, sentences and punctuation. Please check using grammarly software (at least 90%)	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In general, this article still needs a lot of improvement from writing the title to references.	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Purwanto</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>President University, Indonesia</b>