

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_108914
Title of the Manuscript:	What are the factors that influence cyberloafing behaviour in students?
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript seems informative and important for the scientific community</p> <p>2. Yes, title seems and looks good enough as a scientific title. Of course the title could have been adjusted as: "Factors Influencing cyber loafing behaviour in students!"</p> <p>3. To some extent, yes. But some parts needs to be completed such as the "Place and Duration of Study", and also "Methodology" sections and the "future research" section could also be added by the manuscript author</p> <p>4. It seems so, but some considerations are as follows:</p> <p>4.1. Some words can be added as keywords such as: "Students behaviour", "Behavioural Science" and as such.</p> <p>4.2. The opening sentence of the introduction could have started by a much more attractive sentence which can as an example explain the existing situation and the importance of Behavioural science and its relation to Student Behaviour.</p> <p>4.3. The conclusion section could have been completed which can be explained in more detail.</p> <p>4.4. It seems that the manuscript should be edited from the literal and technical point of view which can be adjusted by the manuscript author at present.</p> <p>4.5. etc.</p> <p>5. After consideration of the review comments it could be said that the manuscript could be mentioned as scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The most recent and up-to-date references is 2019! So as we can see and understand much more up – to –date resources should be added by the manuscript author</p> <p>7. For such a scientific article, more scientific resources could have been used by the manuscript author, anyway right know its highly and strongly recommended that the manuscript Author considers the following facts:</p> <p>7.1. High quality resources should be kindly added by the manuscript author (Quality Basis)</p> <p>7.2. Number of the resources should increase (Quantity Basis)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. It seems that the manuscript should be edited from the literal and technical point of view which can be adjusted by the manuscript author at present.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bijan Yavar
Department, University & Country	AllamehTabataba'i University, Iran