



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_29187
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Electronic Word-of-Mouth upon Purchasing Cell Phone on the Internet
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:

(<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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The list of "purposes" (see line 67) should in fact be a list of objectives of the study. Normally, a study has one broadly encompassing statement of purpose and several objectives. It is suggested that the author separate the purpose of the study from the objectives.	This study had revised as below : To summarize, the main purposes of this study is exploring the relationship among product attributes, eWOM, and customer satisfaction, and the objectives are as follows: (1)..... (see line 85)
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The purpose of the literature review has not been clearly stated and key studies that have been done in this area have not been discussed in depth to the point that the reader is left wondering what knowledge gap does this study address? It is suggested that the author state clearly the purpose of literature review and to discuss in depth some of the key studies in the area.	This study had written one paragraph in introduction for discussing the gaps and revised as below: In addition, Chen, Chang, and Hsiao (2014) demonstrated that value-added service and customer satisfaction have a significantly positive effect on electric word-of-mouth. Lim (2015) indicated that Internet advertising (IA) and electronic word of mouth (EWOM) have a positive effect on consumers' perceived value (PV) and perceived risk (PR) of using online group buying (OGB) sites, which in turn have a significant influence on their intentions to shop at OGB sites; meanwhile, a significant relationship also emerges between IA and EWOM. Chen, Teng, Yu, and Yu (2016) showed that online brand-related information from the three sources (eWOM, Neutral/Third Party, and Manufacturer/Retailer) has a positive influence on consumer attitude toward the brand and purchase intention. Baber, Thurasamy, Malik, Sadiq, Islam, and Sajjad (2016) indicated that speaker's trustworthiness and experience have significant and positive effect on online word-of-mouth, and online word-of-mouth has significant and positive effect on attitude, but no effect on purchase



SDI Review Form 1.6

		intention. Wang, Lin, Chen, and Lin (2016) illustrated that Website quality has significant and positive effect on users' cognitive trust and eWOM respectively; however, users' cognitive trust has negative effect on eWOM. Hussain, Ahmed, Jafar, Rabnawaz, and Jianzhou (2017) demonstrated that eWOM has positively influenced on perceived risk. From these previous studies, we can find that there are three gaps: First, for the antecedents, they seldom discuss the product attribute; however, for a product, product attribute is having a long-term value. Second, for the dependent variables, they always discuss the post-satisfaction; however, customers should gather eWOM before they buy the product. It is important for improving the decision-making quality and increasing the post-satisfaction. Third, they seldom discuss the mediating effect of eWOM. According to these gaps, this study will do the further discussion. (see line 62)
	Avoid the use of "prove" (see for example line 45, 267, 634) and replace it with words such as suggest/indicate/imply.	This study had already revised "prove" to "indicate".
	Address some typological & grammatical errors e.g. line 33; line 47 (purposes).	This study had already checked.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article seems to be excessively long in comparison to the articles that this journal normally carries. I have however no information on journal restrictions if any regarding article length. In my view the length of this article can be reduced to a reasonable size without compromising the quality of the paper. For example, by integrating the frameworks used into one.	Thanks for your suggestion and this study had already revised.