

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_88966
Title of the Manuscript:	Consumer Satisfaction of Marketplace Users in Indonesia
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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Comments to the Author and Editor</p> <p>Firstly, many thanks for giving me the chance to review this paper.</p> <p>This study discussed consumer satisfaction of marketplace users in Indonesia . However, the manuscript, in its present form, contains several weaknesses. Appropriate revisions to the following points should be undertaken in order to justify recommendation for publication. For readers to quickly catch your contribution, it would be better to highlight major difficulties and challenges, and your original achievements to overcome them. My major concerns are as follows:</p> <p>The topic is important and interesting.</p> <p>In the Abstract, generally speaking, its structure is made up of "background, purpose, method, result, conclusion, and value section" and 118 words at present. I suggest that the authors add the "value section".</p> <p>In the Keywords, it is good but the authors could choose key and important keywords, and five ones preferred, however, there are 3 ones at present. I suggest that the authors should add more.</p> <p>In the Introduction, the materials of the paper shown should be just up-date to 2022, and the authors also can look through the recent and important paper on this topic again, specially during 2019-2022. Are the authors sure that the research question is clearly outlined?</p> <p>In the Literature review and research Hypotheses, we should link to the recent and most literature, specially 2019-2022. Besides, we also pay more attention to the value and contribution of the paper. However, the manuscript lacks the literature review section. And the authors should add it, use literature to develop the arguments. The literature should be updated, I suggest that. No any interviews are conducted and authors directly jump towards identifying key attributes. And other variables should be updated to the year of 2022.</p> <p>In the Methodology section (Research object), the authors should describe more details about how to investigate.</p> <p>In the Questionnaire design, the authors should introduce and illustrate more about the measures.</p> <p>In the Discussion section, the authors should explain results, derive specific theoretical, practical implications, and describe limitations. The authors should rewrite the section.</p> <p>In the Conclusion and recommendations section, the paper should make a theoretical or practical or methodological contribution. They should be divided into two parts, I suggest that. The authors should rewrite the section.</p> <p>In the References section, we should strictly conduct as APA style. And their DOIs should be added. Besides, it is lack of the recent and important ones, specially, 2019-2022.</p> <p>Based on the contribution and value of the Manuscript, I choose <b>Major Revision</b>.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bei Lyu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>HuaiBei Normal University, China</b>