

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_80495
Title of the Manuscript:	BLOCKS TO ONLINE PURCHASE BEHAVIOUR: RURAL PERSPECTIVE
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.journalajebe.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>-The manuscript must undergo grammar review, as the text is, in a way, repetitive.</p> <p>- The analyses presented in Table 1 do not make sense. If you are explaining rural online shopping, you will have just one R and R-squared values (because you have just one dependant variable). All the variables together will explain a certain percentage of the total. (Later I understood that that R values are that of the independent variables. However, if you have multiple variables, you must always use Adjusted R-squared).</p> <p>- Why did you ANOVA analysis? ANOVA tests differences in multiple group means, so, it does not make sense to use ANOVA in this case. In general, the analyses are somehow confuse. I strongly recomend you to perform Correlation analysis and Exploratory Factor Analysis in order to identify if the items are really measuring the variables that you suppose to be measuring. Later, you ought to perform SEM-PLS. It will provide you a better analysis and a cleaner model, summarizing all the main statistics.</p> <p>- Likert type scales are not quantitative scales, so you must be careful in your analyses. When you deal with likert type scales, the difference between 3 and 4 is not the same as that between 4 and 5. In the same way, the difference between 4 and 5 for me may be different than the difference between 4 and 5 for you, because they are qualitative points (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree). That way, you have to avoid basing you analyses on arguments like "increase of 1 unit on variable x will generate an effect of 0.920 on variable y".</p> <p>- I recommend you to eliminate your main objective, since it requires a qualitative approach, which you have not done. Actually, you did a literature review and selected a set of variables to compose your model, which is not a qualitative research that answers your main objective. I also recommend you to use the specific objective as the main objective, because it reflects better your work.</p> <p>- In order to get better academic recognition, I strongly recommend you to spend more words explaining methodology and the steps you performed to develop the items of the questionnaire (or the source from where you caught them). This is extremely important in scientific work.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>It is not polite to say that someone is ignorant. So, I recommend you to choose another word to replace "ignorant".</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>- Using the word "block" in the title is not the best option to express your understanding. So, I recommend you to change your title. Some suggestion: "Online shopping critical success factors: perspectives of a rural area".</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wilnei Aldir Schneider
Department, University & Country	Federal University Of Amazonas, Brazil