

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_123849
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Exploring the Impact of Consumer Information Search Behavior on the Choice of Communication Products in a Multi-Channel Shopping Environment Using the Technology Acceptance Model</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study is worth raising to find out which shopping system consumers prefer most in shopping	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	This title is appropriate	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	I think it is enough and the content of the abstract has described the entire research process	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This scientific paper is good.. but the background presentation is still very simple in describing the issues raised.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references used are good because the average reference is still under 10 years old so it is still good to use as research reference material	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	is appropriate	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Maybe the conceptual framework of the research can be added, so that readers also understand the flow of this research better	

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	I Gede Rihayana
Department, University & Country	Universitas Mahasaraswati Denpasar, Indonesia