



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.	
<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. - Avoid the use of "prove" (see for example line 45, 267, 634) and replace it with words such as suggest/indicate/imply - Address some typological & grammatical errors e.g. line 33; line 47 (purposes)	
<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.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Godfrey Themba
Department, University & Country	University of Botswana, Botswana