



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	

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	Lots of grammatical error. The author requires to use the proofread service.	We gave the paper to an English expert to check the grammatical error. They are showed in red colour.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	OBJECTIVE The author do not mention the objective of her/his research but just state the research question. Not Web2. The right word is Web 2.0 LR It is seemed that the author is adapted a past research/ framework from Hajli (2014). However the author do not mention what variable(s) been added into the framework. Please avoid using we. Perhap the best word is the researcher METHODOLOGY There is no clear why the author uses student as his/her sample for this study. DISCUSSION In discussion section, the author do not support their finding with other past studies. How the finding of this study support/contradict with other existence theories?	We mentioned the objective in the abstract. We corrected Web 2.0 Word We removed and researchers has been replaced. University students are considered because they are main users of social commerce in Iran. In discussion part we do support our findings with other past studies (6th para in discussion)
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		