



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_49228
Title of the Manuscript:	Perceived E-WOM and University Services Purchase Intentions: The Corporate Image as a Mediator
Type of the 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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>There are abundant number of past researches on the e-WOM and university selection. Follows are a few closely related researches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Al Halbusi, H., & Tehseen, S. (2018). The Effect of Electronic Word-Of-Mouth (EWOM) On Brand Im-age and Purchase Intention: A Conceptual Paper. <i>SocioEconomic Challenges</i>, 2. Bataineh, A. Q. (2015). The Impact of Perceived e-WOM on purchase intention: The mediating role of corporate image. <i>International Journal of Marketing Studies</i>, 7(1), 126. DOI:10.5539/ijms.v7n1p126 Yang, H. P., & Mutum, D. S. (2015). Electronic word-of-mouth for university selection: Implications for academic leaders and recruitment managers. <i>Journal of General Management</i>, 40(4), 23-44. Subriadi, A. P. (2016). ELECTRONIC WORD OF MOUTH (E-WOM): A PATH TO BUILD THE IMAGE OF UNIVERSITY. <i>Journal of Theoretical & Applied Information Technology</i>, 94(1). <p>Uniqueness/ gap the study was hardly stressed except on the geographical area i.e. Jordan. Additionally, there was no justification on the consideration of corporate image in the section of Introduction. Therefore, I don't see a real need for the conduction of this study. Author is suggested to revise the section of Introduction by emphasising the study/s uniqueness and importance.</p> <p>Additionally, no description on the base theory used to develop to support the development of study's variables except citing Bataineh (2015)'s findings. Ideally, study's variables are to be driven from an establish theory. This part should be rewritten.</p> <p>A major portion of (marketing) implications are too obvious. This part should be rewritten.</p>	<p>Three of these articles were already included.</p> <p>Done</p> <p>The weak sections have been supported by more literature.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>I observed the followings in the manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No details on the justification of sample size and the use of multiple linear regression (instead of SEM especially the author has sufficient details to provide the output of SEM), Inappropriate terms used (where purchase intention is deemed inappropriate; author may use enrolment intention, instead), Inclusion of many outdated citations Too shallow description on the outcome of face validity No details on the outcome of pilot study Term used in the title (university service purchase intention) is not reflect in the content of this manuscript 	<p>The multiple regression is statistically manageable, especially of the study simple model.</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Both old and new references have been use in the literature review.</p> <p>Done</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Replaced by students' university enrolment intentions</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	Nil	
---------------------------	-----	--

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Target respondents are schools students. If they are minor, parental consent should have been obtained. But no details are stated in this manuscript. Similarly, no details on the briefing/ notification of personal data protection to the target respondents were provided in this manuscript.</p>	<p>High school students in the Saudi culture are independent enough. They make the university enrolment decisions themselves. Parents only guide when asked.</p>