Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMCS_128856**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ANALYTICAL HIERARCHY PROCESS APPROACH FOR RANKING OF FASHION E-COMMERCE PORTALS IN INDIA - A CASE STUDY**
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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's Feedback** *(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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community by addressing the growing relevance of online shopping in shaping consumer behaviour. It offers a structured methodology, utilizing the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), to evaluate and prioritize e-commerce platforms, a critical factor for improving customer experiences. By applying this approach to prominent Indian e-commerce sites, the study provides valuable insights into platform quality, contributing to the broader understanding of decision-making in digital retail environments and advancing strategies for enhancing user satisfaction.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
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.	The abstract offers a relatively extensive introduction to the subject before presenting the study's objective. However, it concludes without addressing the key findings or emphasizing the study's academic and managerial contributions. This omission diminishes the abstract's effectiveness in conveying the study's significance and impact.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically robust, employing the well-established decision-making methodology, the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), to evaluate e-commerce platforms. This approach is highly suitable for addressing complex, multi-criteria challenges, such as assessing the security of online shopping platforms. However, a more distinct separation between the description of the methodology, the presentation of results (supported by a detailed textual explanation), and the discussion of findings is recommended to improve the study's coherence and readability. Furthermore, it does not seem customary or necessary to separate the objective into an independent section apart from the introduction. Lastly, the discussion of results lacks sufficient depth; addressing these findings in only a single paragraph risk underestimating their importance and impact.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most of the references are recent and relevant. However, the References section needs revision, as it is not written in full according to APA standards.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Overall, the text is clear and easy to understand, with the English writing generally well-executed. However, careful revision is recommended to address minor issues with the usage of certain words. These issues can be easily resolved using text correction software or a thorough proofreading process.	
Optional/General comments	Articles on e-commerce consistently attract readers' attention, given the topic's strong relevance to contemporary life. International reports from Statista and DataReportal further highlight the ongoing expansion of e-commerce, underscoring the need for continued research in this field. However, the manuscript lacks a clear defense of the chosen methodology. Why is it particularly suitable, relevant, or perhaps superior to existing approaches for evaluating the proposed objectives? Among the numerous studies addressing e-commerce evaluation, what distinguishes this work? What are its key contributions to the literature, both in terms of methodological innovation and insights into e-commerce evaluation? Additionally, what are its managerial implications? Does the article support consumer decision-making, or does it provide guidance for e-commerce platform developers? Lastly, why are the two websites identified as user favorites in the results particularly successful? Addressing these questions would strengthen the article, enhance its academic and practical relevance, and better position it within the broader body of research.	

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Eduardo Henrique de Borba**
Department, University & Country	**Santa Catarina State University, Brazil**