

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_84769
Title of the Manuscript:	What Factors of Aftersales Services Affect Customers' Recommendations in Mobile Phones Industry?
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:

(<https://www.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. This research topic is very attractive but as per the objective and hypotheses your sampling distribution is very unbalanced. Therefore, as per your analysis results in the study. The finding and results are not support and achieve your research objective.2. Sample size should be balance as per basic line (1) Work Activities wise and (2) Age wise, as per the choices and decision base of consumers.3. In the methodology and data source part is not well written as per the standard format need to more improve. The methodology should be improved regarding the objective of the study and clearly mention all statistics tolls used by authors in the analysis part for the exam; Need each index to be rewritten with developing an Equation formula?4. Key word,s not add, need to be Improve Keywords as per the JEL Classification Codes of American Economic Association. for exam https://www.aeaweb.org/jel/guide/jel.php5. After improving all points – write again the Conclusion and Recommendations.6. References are not written as per the cited standard.	<p>Thanks for your comments for improving the article. My responses are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sufficient number of samples have been collected and analysed following statistical method and adequacy has been proved in statistical outputs.• As for balance distribution, wise reviewer must have noticed that I followed snowball sampling NOT RANDOM sampling or STRATIFIED SAMPLING. You are well aware that researchers don't have any control over snowball sampling which is purely based on referral. In IS or IT convenient sampling such as snowball is quite common.• Please check the methodology and data collection part, where regression analysis, population size and sampling technique clearly mentioned.• Formula is already there in the research model part.• Keywords have been added as per your suggestions.• American Psychological Association 7th edition has been followed using Mendeley citation software by Elsevier
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	