



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_64755
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants of Consumers' Green Purchase Intension
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b> – Very interesting article and good potential.</p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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)</p>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>Abstract</b> (pag 1 - Line 3) – there is an email in the text, that must be excluded</p> <p><b>Introduction and several parts of the text - Format</b> Introduction (pag 1 - Line 4) – number 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 without the names of the authors. Number 6, with the name of author. Case like this occurred in full text. In my opinion the authors must be referred as done as in the 6. I recommend a general revision in this case.</p> <p>(pag 2 - paragraph 2) – [LOHAS] – the author, cited a font without date(year) and didn't wrote in the references.</p> <p><b>The significance of the study</b> (pag 3) – A lot of information about Pakistan, Pakistani Consumer, Other Countries without references. I think, the authors made a research to find this kind of information (relevant) that should be written here as reference. Ex. Who wrote about the comparison among Pakistan and the practices adopted in the West? I recommend a general revision in this case.</p> <p><b>Theoretical Framework</b> (pag 7) – Correct "Figure 1 – Theoretical Framework" (pag 7) – It's necessary to write the Font under the Figure</p> <p><b>Sample Characteristics</b> (pag 8 - Line 1) – There is no reference to the Table. "As shown at the Table I..." (pag 8 - Line 1) – I recommend to clarify the period of research. Ex. 01/15/2020 to 01/31/2020 (pag 8 - Line 1) – I recommend to clarify who applied the questionnaire, time to response, if were used other tools like google forms, social network etc.</p> <p><b>Reliability Analysis</b> (pag 9 - Line 1) – There is no reference to the Table. "As shown at the Table II..."</p> <p><b>Hypotheses Testing</b> (pag 9 - paragraph 3) – There is no reference to the Table. "As shown at the Table III..."</p> <p><b>Tables</b> In all of the Tables are necessary to write the Font.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>Introduction</b> (pag 3 - line 3) – I recommend to substitute the terms "The authors" in hole text. Ex. "The Authors intend to find the potential positive [...]." Could be: The main goal of this article is to find the potential positive...</p> <p><b>Scale Development</b> (pag 8 - Line 3/4) – I recommend rewrite "Whereas [...] our variables". Note that there "our" twice (pag 8 - Line 14) – I recommend to clarify the scale's values (0 to 5 or -1 to 1) (pag 12 - Line 29) – Substitute the word "consumers' " to consumers</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Hypotheses Testing</b> (pag 10 - table 3) – I recommend to replace the table III by the Figure (1) with the results. In my opinion is easier to visualize and understand.</p> <p><b>Mediation Analysis</b> (pag 10 - Line 4) – I recommend a text general review in situations like this: “The results of step-1, in <b>Table IV</b>,[...].”Between commas</p> <p>(pag 11 - Line 3) – I recommend a text general review in situations like this: “The results of step-1, in <b>Table V</b>,[...].”Between commas (pag 11 - Line 12) – I recommend a text general review in situations like this: “The results of step-1, in <b>Table VI</b>,[...].”Between commas</p>	
---	---	--

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer’s comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author’s comment</b> (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)</p>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Marcelo Silva Ângelo Ferreira</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>FUNCESI – Fundação Comunitária de Ensino Superior de Itabira, Brazil</b></p>