

**Paper: “The Impact of Mobile Technology on Consumers’ Charitable Behaviors:
a Research Protocol”**

Submitted: 21 May 2022

Accepted: 08 July 2022

Published: 31 July 2022

Corresponding Author: Hafid Agourram

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n22p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n22p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ayobami Lawal

Reviewer 2: Angelica Sterling
Universidad del Caribe, Mexico

Reviewer 3: Tímea Bernadett Mátyás
University of Public Service, Hungary

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

No, the article talks more about the strategies that can be used on mobile devices to attract and retain potential donors in your conceptual framework. In addition to the above, it is necessary to mention in the title that it is a research protocol

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

It describes very well the benefit that the mobile channel can bring to charity organizations, however, it does not clearly mention what is the main object of this research.

Good work on presenting some of the hypotheses that will guide the research

The methodology used to carry out this research is not presented

Being a research protocol, results are not expected, however, the abstract may present some of the most important findings of the theoretical review.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes, there are some errors, that have been marked up yellow on the reviewed version

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

It presents very well the development of each of the hypotheses that will serve as a guide to carrying out the investigation.

It is necessary to specify the method followed for the collection of theoretical information.

The method for data collection and sampling should be clearer and more precise, it is not clear how potential donors will be selected to participate in the main study or the characteristics that these participants should specifically have.

For the second study, it is not clear how the session permanence or qualitative aspects such as the intention to donate, and the perception of offline staff will be measured, it is necessary to clarify

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Clear and well presented

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

There must be a clear congruence and connection between the title, the objective pursued by the project, the methodology, and the conclusions.

Once the title is redesigned and the objective of this research is presented, there may be greater clarity in the conclusions derived from the above.

In the conclusions presented, the authors talk more about consumer behavior than about the strategies used to attract them in the app or mobile, it is therefore important that everything has consistency, and be directed to the same point

On the second paragraph, they present even more variables that were not described in the protocol and that give rise to greater vagueness in the information.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The errors have been marked with red on the reviewed document

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Very well connected the research questions with the hypothesis presented.
It is necessary to deeply describe the methodology to carry out the research.
Important to connect the title, with the main research objective and the conclusions so far.

Strongly recommend reviewing the donor's profile (potential and actual) and researching their behavior to get to know a better understanding of their preferences and habits.

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, the title is clear and the content of the article are in tandem which gives concise information to readers and researchers.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The objects are missing in the abstracts and the structure of the short sentences makes it not detailed enough for overview of the article at a glance.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Not really, but the use of et al where the authors has not been cited earlier but the first time is much in the content of the article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, since the data are gathered from an online survey.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes, it is clear except the use of et al when the citation is coming for the first time in the content.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author(s) did an excellent research work but the abstract needs to be looked into for words structuring.

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

I agree.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

I agree.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

I agree. There are a few errors and typos.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

I agree.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The subject is good. There are a few mistakes and typos that you should correct. Regarding the methods of the paper, I have a sense of lack. Besides the online surveys, for instance, I would suggest adding some other types of methodology, like data processing methods, explanations of data, analytics, and statistical data processing methods. I enjoyed reading the literature review, conceptual framework, and hypothesis development parts. These subchapters were well structured and

thoughtful. I also liked the introduction, but I would like to suggest explaining your thoughts in more detail to arouse the readers' attention, like in the conceptual framework and hypothesis parts. The conclusion on the other hand, is too short. You should extend it, and explain all the findings. Overall, I recommend publishing the paper, and I wish you good luck and success in your academic work.
