

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_81491
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECT OF CAFÉ ATMOSPHERE ON GENERATION Y (MILLENNIALS) PURCHASE DECISIONS ON OASE CAFE
Type of the Article	Original Research

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.journalajebo.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>I find the topic basically very interesting and would therefore encourage the authors to further improve their study so that the results become more meaningful. I have the following comments in detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The research question is insufficiently stated in the introduction. What was the motivation for the study? What scientific literature should the study link to and what added value should the results provide to the scientific community? - The focus on the OASE café is not justified. What makes the OASE café a special object of inquiry? Are the empirical results generalizable despite the restriction to the OASE café? - The conceptual model is insufficiently explained. I miss a theoretical rationale for the individual variables and likewise a robust theoretical foundation for the assumed causal effects. - The hypotheses need to be better theoretically justified and anchored in the literature. - The research literature on purchase decision has not been exhaustively reviewed. In fact, there are already quite a number of related papers that have not been considered in the present study. - I would also like to see a better theoretical treatment of the purchase decision of millennials as a special focus group. <p>I also have some methodological comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The data set is not described. Who participated in the study? What did the sample look like from a socio-demographic point of view, for example? Here it would be useful to include some descriptive statistics. - The sample size is comparatively small. What impact does this have on the results? - The items of the survey should be listed in a table. Furthermore, the sources for each item should be provided. - The procedure of construct formation is unclear. - The empirical model does not include control variables. - The Global F-test (Table 8) has only a low statistical significance, which is problematic for the interpretation of the results. - No robustness tests were performed. - There is also a missing section with empirical limitations. <p>I would like the authors to take my comments as constructive criticism to help</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	further improve the manuscript. I wish good luck!	
Minor REVISION comments	The manuscript should be linguistically revised and go through a proofreading process before publication.	
Optional/General comments	I would be careful with the statement "research is causal because it is done with a quantitative method". The fact that the effects are causal must first be theoretically justified. The choice of a quantitative method does not turn the effects into causal relationships.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Johann Valentowitsch
Department, University & Country	University of Stuttgart, Germany