



Paper: **“The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Online Shopping”**

Submitted: 02 January 2025

Accepted: 20 February 2025

Published: 28 February 2025

Corresponding Author: Khuslen Gantumur

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2025.v21n4p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2025.v21n4p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Elisa Rancati
University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy

Reviewer 2: Luan Bekteshi
University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer E:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The Title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract needs to be supplemented with clarifications regarding the methodology used. A short description is needed.

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

There are quite a few grammatical errors.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The author should explain from which sources he obtained the literature he used.

Did he choose articles randomly or articles that belong to a certain time period?

Did he use any keywords in the search or not?

I think that adding explanations regarding these questions better explains the methodology and increases the quality of the paper.

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

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

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

The Conclusions are accurate and supported by the content of the article.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of References is comprehensive and appropriate

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

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 abstract needs to be supplemented with clarifications regarding the methodology used. A short description is needed.

The author should explain from which sources he obtained the literature he used.

1. Did he choose articles randomly or articles that belong to a certain time period?
2. Did he use any keywords in the search or not?

I think that adding explanations regarding these questions better explains the methodology and increases the quality of the paper.

Reviewer F:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

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

No, the title isn't clear and it isn't adequate to the content of the article. the paper develops a little literature review. Why don't I find this in the title? The author can rewrite the title with a question, a suggestion, etc

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract clearly presents introduction, purposes, results, and conclusion. it includes a clear conclusion. Each part has a different communicative objective. this abstract doesn't examine methodology probably because it's very weak. If this paper is a literature review, 16 papers aren't enough.

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

No, I didn't find them.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are explained clearly but the reader can be a bit confused.

In results, the reader finds "For our secondary data analysis, we focused on studies published between 2017 and 2024 that explore AI's role in customer behavior, AI in shopping platforms, and purchase decision-making". I suggest to write the content about methodology in the method section of the paper.

Please check more in depth methods and results. Sometimes the reader find useful information about methods in results and vice versa.

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

The body of the paper is clear. I suggest to check errors with IA.

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

the conclusion is accurate but I suggest to cancel the capital letter. for example from "Reviewing and Analyzing Existing Research by Foreign Scholars" to "Reviewing

and analyzing existing research by foreign scholars". suggestions for further research are good and well done

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

references are updated. it seems very strange to review only 16 papers in 7 years. why does the author put in references "<https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i5.3011>

if the paper is a literature review, please develop the references

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

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]

2

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]

1

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

more tips for writing a good literature review missed in this paper. For example, define key terms, insert table and figure for geographical aspects of papers and journals, etc.
