

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_119830
Title of the Manuscript:	Analyzing the Impact of Regret on Customer Churn: A Case Study in E-commerce
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The aim of this study is to analyze the impact of various behavioral features on customer churn in an e-commerce context. However, there are several points to consider for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The title is clear and informative, setting the stage for the study. However, the phrase "Case Study" suggests a detailed analysis of a specific instance, the use of publicly available data might not align with this connotation. Kindelly, you can change the paper title to be "Assessing the Impact of Regret on Customer Churn in E-Commerce: A Data-Driven Analysis". The abstract s overly detailed, making it dense and difficult to quickly grasp the key points. Simplifying the language and focusing on the main results and implications could enhance clarity. In the introduction section, the references to prior works are too brief and do not sufficiently discuss their methodologies or findings. In the methodology section, adding more context on why specific thresholds were chosen it would make this section more accessible. Additionally, the reliance on a single dataset from Kaggle limits the generalizability of the findings. The interpretation of feature importance could be expanded to explain how these findings align with or contradict existing theories in the literature. Additionally, the impact of any data preprocessing steps on feature importance is not sufficiently addressed. The discussion could also benefit from a comparison with similar studies, highlighting how this study contributes to the existing body of knowledge. Ensuring that all referenced works are the most recent and relevant would enhance the credibility and depth of the literature review. Additionally, the formatting of the references should be consistent and adhere to a specific citation style. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Asia Mahdi Naser Alzubaidi
Department, University & Country	University of Karbala, Iraq