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.	**The proposed solutions/approaches are not well-aligned with contemporary research trends and address existing gaps in the literature.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**The title is generally clear and reflects the manuscript's content. However, it could be refined for conciseness and specificity if needed. A suggested 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.	**The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from [e.g., providing a brief explanation of the methodology, highlighting key results, or emphasizing the novelty of the study]. Consider adding more details on the practical implications or omitting overly technical jargon for broader accessibility.**	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	**The title is generally not clear and reflects the manuscript's content. However, it could not be refined for conciseness and specificity. It is copied to internet source similarity 35% .**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	**The references are relevant and sufficient for the scope of the manuscript. If applicable, consider including more recent studies,**	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	**The language quality is not suitable for scholarly communication. Major improvements in clarity, conciseness, or grammar might enhance readability.**	
Optional/General comments	**Additional insights on [specific aspect, e.g., limitations, broader implications] could further strengthen the discussion.**	

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:	**Pushpendra Kumar Verma**
Department, University & Country	**IIMT University, India**