



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_30606
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigation of the relationship between social support, relationship quality and social commerce
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	I would like to recommend to the authors of this manuscript to describe briefly the methods used for their research within the abstract. The issue of data used is very important for making any conclusions, too. However, I have strong impression that this is not the random sample, the authors write about 384 volunteers. How were these volunteers chosen? If it would be a public inquiry, the forming of any conclusions is problematic. The manuscript has a very well-prepared introduction chapter, where the authors present the current state of knowledge in that area, justify the need for further research in the area, formulate the aims of the paper and partial scientific questions for which the article has answer. The paper has a very high quality search. Also the structure of the manuscript is very well made. On the other hand, the overall article seems to be little scientific, it has only about three tables of statistical outputs, otherwise the authors come out largely from already known facts, which does not suffice for so long manuscript.	The methods used for research is highlighted in the abstract. Regarding the 384 volunteers we have mentioned that firstly we asked two questions to find out if they are eligible to answer the questions. 1. whether he or she is the member of Facebook or Telegram and 2. whether had internet shopping experience or not.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	References are not common used already within the abstract. Table 1 has some inaccuracies. Tables 2 and 3 lie on two pages. The authors failed in edges of the paper, which Table 2 greatly exceeds. Gaps between words in the text sometimes lack. Graph 1 has not its title, Graph 2 has its title on the next page.	We corrected the abstract and removed the reference. We presume that table 2 and 3 should be checked by the journal at the end and fit them to page. Otherwise we will do it based on the journal criteria as soon as you accept to publish it. For gaping between words we checked it again. We corrected the graph title.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper seems to be undone, after adjustments it will be publishable likely. I see the major problem in the data used.	Thanks for your comment. We did considered all of your comments
---	--	---