

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_118160
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of product quality, service quality and eWOM on repurchase intention: consumer satisfaction as a mediating variable
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/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>The area of the manuscript is OK. The problem is the way of presenting and analysing it.</p> <p>Need to improve. Better to mention the case of the study</p> <p>The abstract is OK.</p> <p>The flow of the article should be improved. you need to write them correctly. Better to have sub-topics</p> <p>Ex : Background information and the research problem Research objectives and questions Significance of the study Literature Review</p> <p>There are areas to improve. The way of collecting data (Determining the sample size, the conceptual framework should be drawn correctly) The Scientific standard of writing journal articles is missing here.</p> <p>The way of presenting citations and references cannot be accepted. Better to check and study previous articles published in the journal, Further, I have given the comments in the manuscript. You need to refer them</p> <p>Additional Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - When you write a hypothesis, do not come to pre-conclusions. If you write positively, you need to mention the null hypothesis also. (Refer to the comments given in the manuscript) - Need to mention the implications of the research with the conclusion 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Researchers need to follow scientific writing correctly. Better to proofread the article again</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>You need to follow the academic writing correctly. There is a specific standard for writing articles for journals. Therefore, the flow of the article cannot be seen.</p> <p>The researcher can improve the article by improving the academic writing and referencing</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:	R.S.S.W. Arachchi
Department, University & Country	Sabaragamuwa University of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka