

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_98633
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF FACTORS INFLUENCING INTENTION AND BEHAVIOR OF PIRACY OF DIGITAL ENTERTAINMENT PLATFORMS IN INDONESIA
Type of the Article	Review 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.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)
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)	<p>It is one among the many inputs available for the scientific community. The title needs to be rephrased.</p> <p>The abstract could reflect on the quantitative findings of the study. Appropriate Needs proper data modelling and the assumptions made for choosing a model.</p> <p>Yes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the sample size of the survey 2. Mention the sample size formula. 3. Types of respondents should be mentioned. 4. Write the literature review summary and gaps. 5. How can you collect primary data illegally.(para 3.2) 6. How did you arrive at 200 respondents? 7. Why did you check only 8 platforms and why not others. 8. Why the age of the respondents was limited to 30 years. 9. Explain the significance of Table.8 10. Has H5 been validated? 	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Needs serious upgradation	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Figure 1 should be labeled at the bottom of the diagram/chart. 2. Some more keywords are required. 	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	C. S. Chethan Kumar
Department, University & Country	India