

Advance Report

Assignment No: ABCDE

This report summarizes the overall quality of your edited manuscript. For each section, we provide specific comments on the quality and these are substantiated by examples (where available).

Table of Content

Structural Review 3-6

Overall Manuscript

Title & Abstract

Introduction

Materials and Methods

Results

Discussion

Peripheral Text Review 7

Figures and/or Tables

Bibliography

Content, Terminology, Style, and Format Review 8-9

Terminology

Style

Formatting

Structural Review

■ Overall Manuscript

Is the paper written in a way that is accessible and understandable to the intended audience? If not, have any changes been made to improve the clarity and readability of the paper?

- While the paper is generally accessible, we have made and/or recommended changes to enhance clarity and readability.

Are there parts in certain sections (e.g., Introduction, Methods, etc.) that should be moved to another section?

- We suggest moving some content to improve the paper's overall clarity and coherence.

(We found many passages in the Results section that could be moved to the Discussion section to make the latter section robust. We have added detailed comments in the manuscript explaining our rationale.)

Does the paper have a logical structure that helps the reader follow the author(s)'s arguments? If not, does the author need to rearrange, rewrite, expand, or summarize any sections to improve the logical flow of the paper?

- The manuscript currently is not logically structured. Consider reorganizing, rephrasing, expanding, and/or summarizing certain sections based on our remark(s) for guidance.

(After moving passages from Results to Discussion, the findings will need to be expanded to make the section more detailed.)

Does the paper provide a clear and concise overview of the research question, methods/ approaches, findings, and implications?

- The paper lacks a clear overview of the research question, methods, findings, and/or implications. Incorporate these details based on our remark(s).

Are there any content gaps or missing critical research points in the manuscript?

- There are many content gaps and missing critical research points in the manuscript. To improve comprehensiveness, please address these gaps through additional research and content integration; refer to our remark(s) for details.

(The review of literature primarily consists of antiquated literature. It should be supplemented with more recent research.)

■ Title

Is the title concise and grammatically accurate?

- The title is generally concise and grammatically accurate, but it required minor adjustments for improvement.

Does the title accurately reflect the content of the paper?

- The title requires further changes to reflect the content of the paper. Refer to our detailed remark(s).

(As the study is an overview of consumer behavior in the e-commerce market, consider revising the title to clearly indicate this focus. Currently, the title refers to consumer behavior without specifying which the market.)

■ Abstract

Does the abstract offer a succinct overview of the paper, effectively summarizing its key aspects, and follow a logical order?

- The abstract's logical structure effectively guides readers through the paper's main points, providing a clear understanding of the research. Some minor revisions were required to further enhance the abstract's clarity and organization.

Are the following stated: Purpose, Methods and Materials, Results, Conclusions?

- We have added important information to the abstract, such as purpose, methods and materials, results, and conclusions.

Does the abstract include relevant field-specific keywords and terminology?

- The abstract lacks field-specific keywords and terminology. Consider revising it to enhance its resonance within the field.

(For example, use terms such as "e-commerce retailing" instead of "online shopping." Similar suggestions have been added in the manuscript.)

■ Introduction

Is the scope of the study appropriately outlined?

- Information about the scope of the study needs to be included in the Introduction.

(Kindly include this detail prior to submitting your manuscript to a journal.)

Does the paper acknowledge the limitations of other studies in this field of research?

- The paper acknowledges the limitations of other studies in this field. However, some modifications were needed for better clarity and relevance.

■ Materials & Methods

Is the methodology described in enough detail that another researcher could replicate the study?

- We have revised the methodology description to make it more clear and to ensure that it is reproducible by another researcher.

Is the research methodology robust and devoid of any intentional bias (e.g., randomization of samples)?

- The research methodology employed in the study is sound and demonstrates robustness. It is also free from intentional bias.

Are all key techniques/approaches employed discussed in the Methods or another relevant section?

- The key techniques and approaches employed in the study are not sufficiently addressed in the Methods section or another relevant section. Consider revising the Methods section to include these techniques and approaches.

(You have employed empirical analysis for hypothesis testing. However, the inclusion and exclusion criteria for data points need to be elaborated on.)

Are the evaluation techniques and/or parameters/variables clearly outlined?

- We have made revisions to the description of evaluation techniques and/or parameters/variables to make it more clear.

Was statistical significance of the data appropriate?

- The statistical analysis is appropriate and well-conducted.

Are the statistical analyses in the text appropriate and do they support the findings?

- The statistical analyses in the text are appropriate and effectively support the findings.

■ Results

Does the language used in presenting results facilitate understanding without unnecessary jargon or ambiguity?

- The language used in presenting results still contains unnecessary jargon and ambiguity. The author(s) needs to address and enhance the readability of the content. Please refer to our remark(s).

Is there a clear separation between presenting results and interpreting their implications?

- Further refinement is required to separate the presentation of results from their interpretation. Please refer to our remark(s).

(The main findings are generally included in the Results section, and the interpretation of the findings and its applicability are mentioned in the Discussion section.)

Have the key findings from tables and figures been effectively summarized within the main text?

- The text clearly and concisely summarizes the key findings presented in tables and figures.

■ Discussion**Does the paper discuss the implications of the findings and how they contribute to the existing body of knowledge?**

- We have added a statement that explains the importance of the study's findings.

Are all the key results convincingly discussed in light of whether they did or did not support the hypotheses?

- Some of the arguments in the Discussion section regarding the key results that support the central hypothesis are not persuasive. Please see our remark(s) for details.

(There is a gap between your hypothesis and finding and their interpretation. We have highlighted these gaps and specified ways to bridge them in order to strengthen your contention.)

Are the conclusions of the paper clear and concise?

- Some of the conclusions are unclear and need to be made concise.

(Currently, the conclusions are unclear owing to wordiness. We have added suggestions in the manuscript to delete sentences and/or phrases to enhance clarity and conciseness.)

Are there any conclusions that are not supported by current study findings or a literature review?

- There are some conclusions in the paper that are not supported by the findings or relevant literature. Please refer to our remark(s) for details.

(After addressing the gap between findings and interpretation, as stated above, this aspect will be clear and evident.)

Are the limitations of the study mentioned in the conclusion section, informing the direction of future research?

- The limitations of the study are not mentioned in the conclusion section. Include this detail as it will guide the direction of future research.

Peripheral Text Review

■ Figures and Tables

Do the content and presentation of the figures/tables complement the narrative in the manuscript?

- The Figures and/or Tables are consistent with the main text.

Are all the tables and figures cited in the main text?

- Some of the Figures and/or Tables are not cited in the main text.

(Figures 1 and 3 as well as Table 5 need to be cited in the main text before they are presented in the manuscript.)

Do table and figure legends provide all the necessary information?

- While Table/Figure legends are generally clear, concise, and accurate, there may be some instances where they lack essential information.

(The legends for Figures 1 and 2 need to spell out all abbreviations used.)

Can each figure/table stand alone without reference to the text?

- Some of the Figures and/or Tables need reference to the text for better comprehension.

■ Bibliography

Are factual statements appropriately supported with references?

- Some of the factual statements in the paper are not supported by citations.

(We have highlighted statements in the manuscript that require citations.)

Is the cited literature directly relevant to the scope of the study?

- The majority of the literature that is cited in the paper is relevant to the study, but there may be few minor exceptions.

(The literature cited also needs to include more recent research, as the antiquated ones may not be directly relevant owing to advances in the field.)

Is the citation style consistent throughout the paper?

- Most of the references in the paper are cited in a consistent format, but there were few minor exceptions.

(We have formatted the manuscript and made the citation style consistent overall.)

Content, Terminology, Style, and Format Review

■ Terminology

Are the terms used in the paper valid in the field or have they been newly coined? If they have been newly coined, have they been defined?

- While most of the terminology in the paper is well-established, a few terms could benefit from further clarification or definition.

(For instance, the term "neuromarketing," needs detailed description at the first instance for a comprehensive background.)

Is the technical nomenclature used in the paper appropriate and consistent?

- The technical nomenclature in the paper is somewhat appropriate and consistent.

(Technical terms could be more field-specific. We have added remarks at relevant instances that will aid in making the necessary changes.)

■ Style

Does the capitalization, italicization, and number style used in the paper follow the conventions of the subject area?

- The capitalization, italicization, and numbering adhere to the conventions of the subject area.

■ Formatting

Does the structure and length of each manuscript section conform to all other journal guidelines?

- The organization and length of each section in the manuscript align with the journal's guidelines.

If a style guide has been stipulated by the journal guidelines (Chicago, AMA, APA, ACS, etc.), was it followed? If yes, mention the style guide and version.

- The style guide outlined in the guidelines was adhered to as applicable, but the author(s) should review certain aspects.

(These aspects have been highlighted in the manuscript along with detailed comments and next steps.)

If a template has been provided by the journal, was it applied as per guidelines?

- ▣ The paper has been formatted according to the template outlined in the guidelines.

If additional materials (e.g., highlights) are required by the journal, have they been provided and are these consistent with the journal guidelines?

- ▣ All the required additional materials as per the journal's guidelines have already been included.

Does the manuscript follow all the guidelines of its target journal? If not, have you provided the necessary remark(s) for the author(s) to address the gaps?

- ▣ All the guidelines outlined by the journal have been followed.

