

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>)

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. Yes, very interesting and applicable, but several improvements must be made;</p> <p>2. No, because there are no plenty conclusive elements in the text to make any suggestion;</p> <p>3. No, there are several elements that are not in the text;</p> <p>4. No, there are correct structure. The text is incomplete. For example, there are not related to the articles analysed. How many articles were selected? Which year? Which methodology was based to choose the articles? What was the slash point?</p> <p>5. No, there are several conclusions and "speculations" that can't be done in the material;</p> <p>6. No, for this subject there are several recent references;</p> <p>I suggest that any reference be discussed in the text, there is no way to take conclusions with this material. The article has several objectives and in this case, no one was answered.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I suggest that any references be discussed in the text, creating graphs etc. There is no way to draw conclusions from the way it was written.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marcelo Silva Angelo Ferreira
Department, University & Country	UNIFUNCESI, Brazil