



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJEMT_17671
Title of the Manuscript:	Online Marketing Strategy for Business Development in Malaysia
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	-The authors reported that “online purchase complexity” and the “need satisfaction” were mediator variables. The authors need to consider three main types of mediation: 1) partial, 2) full, and 3) indirect. In order to be mediators, the following links should be added and tested in the hypothesis model. online process simplicity → online purchase complexity; product commitment → online purchase complexity; product homogeneity→ online purchase complexity; product visualization→ online purchase complexity; cyberculture effect→ online purchase complexity; internet information technology → online purchase complexity; online process simplicity → need satisfaction; product commitment → need satisfaction; product homogeneity→ need satisfaction; product visualization→ need satisfaction; cyberculture effect→ need satisfaction; internet information technology→ need satisfaction; -The paper needs to expand the literature review part to provide more rationale of hypotheses H1-H8. Clearly define the terms about all determinants. - The authors need to clearly report a recruitment process and data collection. -The authors used specific scales that previous researchers already developed. Report the names of previous researchers who originally created scales. -Report reliability for each construct.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-H1, H4, H5, and H6 were not supported. The authors did not explain the reason why these statements were not in the case of this study with empirical reasoning and evidence. Explain in detail why some hypotheses were not supported by study findings. - In the conclusion and implications part, more discussions and more descriptions are recommended. Elaborate upon how companies use these results and if you have any details about how the company involved uses or intends to use these results.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ju-Young M. Kang
Department, University & Country	University of Hawaii, USA