

Paper: “Online Shopping: A Survey on Consumer Buying Behavior in Bangladesh”

Submitted: 26 April 2022

Accepted: 19 May 2022

Published: 31 May 2022

Corresponding Author: Sraboni Ahmed

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n15p93](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n15p93)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Milan Radošević

University of Novi Sad and University Business Academy in Novi Sad, Serbia

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 27 th April	Date Review Report Submitted: 1 st May
Manuscript Title: Online Shopping: A Case Study on Consumer Buying Behavior in Bangladesh	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0515/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>The abstract should be rewritten. The objects, methods and results have not been clearly and chronologically discussed. Authors must specify the objects first, then</i>	

<i>discuss the methods adopted i.e., data collection and data analysis and finally what have been found with challenges or future directions.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Grammatical and spelling issues are ok.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>The study methods are not clearly explained. Author just mentioned the methods. Need elaboration.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>Author just mentioned the data findings from survey. These data should be processed, analyzed and converted into information with proper explanation.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Insufficient references.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Authors are advised to go through the entire manuscript and improve the language. The research method and findings should be precisely discussed.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Milan Radošević	
University/Country: University of Novi Sad and University Business Academy in Novi Sad / Serbia	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 02.05.2022
Manuscript Title: Online Shopping: A Case Study on Consumer Buying Behavior in Bangladesh	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0515/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The methodology used in the paper needs to be described better.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
The methodology used in the paper needs to be described better. There is no detailed description of the questionnaire just simple not that authors use standard computer software. Whether the validity of the questionnaire was done or the reader should believe that the results are not "adjusted"?. How was the data of the respondents collected (by email or some other tool)? What was the percentage of survey sent and returned? What was the percentage correctness of the returned questionnaires? According to the number of respondents (150), why was no statistical analysis performed? The authors note that in addition to the survey, they obtained data from various journals and research articles. There is only one paper cited in paper that deals with the topic of Bangladesh. Why didn't the authors cite other sources?	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
Unnecessary indication of data first in the table and then authors use histograms to display the same data/results. One gets the impression that this will cover a larger number of pages in the paper itself. The reader gets the impression that authors just wants to achieve as many pages in the paper as possible. What is the scientific contribution of this paper (if, for example, we compare this paper with paper: <i>Hoque, M. R., Ali, M. A., & Mahfuz, M. A. (2015). An Empirical Investigation on the Adoption of E-Commerce in Bangladesh. Asia Pacific Journal of Information Systems, 25(1).</i>)?	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
The conclusion must be accompanied by answers to the above remarks.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
The review of the paper concludes that the authors refer to nine (9) references in the paper, while the text refers to ten (10) references (see Hajli, 2014???. By reviewing the literature, the authors can conclude more significant literature in the research field (see for example Rahman, M. A., Islam, M. A., Esha, B. H., Sultana, N., & Chakravorty, S. (2018). Consumer buying behavior towards online shopping: An empirical study on Dhaka city, Bangladesh. <i>Cogent Business & Management, 5</i>(1), 1514940.; Tinne, W. S. (2011). Factors affecting impulse buying behavior of consumers at superstores in Bangladesh. <i>ASA University review, 5</i>(1), 209-220.; Abir, T., Husain, T., Waliullah, S. S. A., Yazdani, D. M. N., Salahin, K. F., & Rahman, M. A. (2020). Consumer buying behavior towards e-commerce: A survey study of consumers at a selected online shopping site in Dhaka, Bangladesh. <i>Open Journal of Business and Management, 8</i>(6), 2716-2728.; Rahman, M. T. (2016). Customers' attitude	

towards online shopping: The case of Bangladesh. *World*, 6(2), 82-91. **and many others).**

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I encourage the authors not to give up on correcting the paper but a significant revision of the paper is needed.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: