

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_128316
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Price Perception and E-promotion on Repurchase Intention Mediated by E-satisfaction in Tokopedia E-commerce in Bandung City
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

PART 1:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>General Comments The manuscript addresses a relevant topic in e-commerce, focusing on the relationship between price perception, e-promotion, e-satisfaction, and repurchase intention in Tokopedia users in Bandung. However, significant methodological, theoretical, and presentation-related issues hinder its contribution to the field. Below is a detailed assessment and suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Ambiguity in Methodology: 1. The study claims to use convenience sampling but does not provide a robust justification for why this non-probability sampling method is suitable. Furthermore, a sample size of 123 seems inconsistent with the justification provided (30 times the variables would typically require a larger sample). 2. The use of a Likert scale is mentioned, but there is no discussion on the validity and reliability of this scale for the given context.</p> <p>Theoretical and Literature Gaps: 1. The literature review section does not adequately build a case for why e-satisfaction is an effective mediator for the studied relationships. Inconsistencies in Hypotheses Testing: 1. The t-values and significance levels in the hypothesis test tables are not always consistent with the interpretations. For example, a failure to reject the null hypothesis (H0) does not support the practical recommendations suggested in the paper.</p> <p>Formatting Error: 1. Inappropriate Referencing 2. The Sources of Table and Figure is not mentioned 3. Abstract must not contain citations, overall failed to explore the study</p> <p>Overall Assessment Contribution: The manuscript addresses a timely and relevant topic but fails to provide meaningful contributions due to methodological flaws, weak theoretical grounding, and poor presentation of results.</p> <p>Decision: Major Revisions Required Key Revisions: 1. Justify the sampling method and align the sample size with the methodology. 2. Provide a clearer interpretation of statistical tests and revise the discussion accordingly. 3. Improve the language, formatting, and overall readability. 4. Update the literature review and references to include more relevant and global studies. 5. Reframe the conclusion to focus on actual findings rather than unsupported recommendations.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Md Istiaq Mohhamad Shuvo</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Noakhali Science and Technology University, Bangladesh</p>