

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_103627
Title of the Manuscript:	A study of consumer price perception and reaction to price promotion in online shopping
Type of the 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>)

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. It provides conceptual grounds based for logic and empirical evidence to warrant further studies. The arguments are interesting. It also reflects managerial relevance for online retailers if the gaps exposed are strategically exploited.</p> <p>Yes, because it signals the contents in the report but needs to indicate the context</p> <p>The aim is somewhat not directly focused as the study presented some valid case for the choice before hammering on the aim of the study</p> <p>Yes, as it may depend on the Journal's requirement</p> <p>Somewhat scientifically correct. The reservations come at the backdrop of these limitations identified:</p> <p>At the introduction</p> <p>No theory to explain the nature of purported relationships Fails to present the context of the study Does not provide summary of the structure of the rest of the study There is no solid statement of problem provided even though an attempt was made to some extent</p> <p>At the Literature Review and Proposition</p> <p>Development of the propositions ignored the roles of theory/theories in justifying such purported relationships</p> <p>Most of the cited literature are old Omitted a model specification or conceptual framework: The arguments are meant for causal research amid test of difference, hence should have perhaps developed a conceptual framework. Again, the study failed to provide information on the proposed research methodology appropriate for the study. I think this is important and requires consideration in the revised version</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes except for this case: '...The virtual world contains infinite information that can ... obtain instantly. Needs to insert "be". The logical flow of thoughts is accurate and visible. It paints accurate picture in the minds of the readers</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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lawrence Yaw Kusi
Department, University & Country	University of Cape Coast, Ghana