



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_6344
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigating the Effect of Subjective Factors on the Online Shopping Willingness
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The experiments and the results discussion are both focused on the Iran domain. Therefore I would suggest to add something like "...in Iran" at the end of paper's title. However, this would dramatically reduce the relevance of the findings. 2. The methodology needs to be better discussed. The authors refer to a "Krejcie and Morgan" table but there is not any reference and they also do not explain how this table works. The authors also refer to a "library method" which is not described or referenced in the paper. 3. This reviewer think that the questionnaire used to collect data should be included in the paper (maybe in an Appendix section). Otherwise, it is not possible to understand what kind of data are collected and how they are collected (i.e., asking users to rate sentences or asking users to answer questions or other).	1. 'in Iran' was added to the end of title. 2. Methodology was revised and some statements were expressed concerning reliability and validity as well as other issues. 3. The referent of Kerjesi and Morgan chart, that is used in determining the number of samples, was mentioned in the section concerning references. 4. The library method which was not clearly explained and lacked a valid reference was eliminated. 5. Explanations were presented concerning the Lickert Spectrum and the source of questions.
Minor REVISION comments	1. Many references are missing. For example, (Krejcie and Morgan), (Murray, 1991), (Groth, 1995), (Bauer, 1960), (Kogen and Wallach), etc are missing in the reference section. Please, check carefully that each cited paper is reported in the reference section. 2. All the critical sentences need to be referred. For example, at the beginning of section 4.1 when authors talk about rotated matrix and varimax rotation or when authors present the confirmatory factor analysis.	1. the following references were added after searching: Murray, 1991 Grewal et al. 1994 Dodds et al. 1991 Korgaonkar and Moschis, 1987 2. The following references were eliminated because their sources were not found. Corresponding parts were also removed from the paper: Groth, 1995 Bauer, 1960; Kogen and Wallach



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Page 3, line 6: I do not understand what (p.87) stands for. 2. I would prefer that authors use “figure” instead of “model” when referring to the figures. 3. “model(3)” figure and reference are split into two pages. 4. Authors talk about SHETAB system in the discussion section but they do not explain what is this.	1. The term (p.87) in line 6 of page 3 is related to a reference that was omitted, but is fully replaced now. 2. The term ‘Figure’ is presently used for the presented models instead of the term ‘model’. 3. Explanations on the SHETAB System are provided in conclusion section.
---	---	---