



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_50119
Title of the Manuscript:	Decision-Making Management of Consumer Behavior Based on Component Regression Model
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>-There are some typos and grammatical errors. A proof reading is needed (...which is the focus and innovative of this paper;..... thanks to the progress of Internet;.....). Please conduct a careful proof reading.</p> <p>-The paper is not comprehensive in terms of explaining the methodology. Details on the full process should be explained in detail. How did you develop questionnaire, how did you adapt them? What is the sampling method? Don't you think the number of samples is insufficient (n=119). Have you conducted a pilot study?</p> <p>- Consumer or customer please use just one of those.</p> <p>- You did not use the number system when referencing within the text. Why did you use the numbering system in the Reference part?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thanks for your comments. I have conducted a more careful proof reading as you suggested, and I have also corrected those types and grammatical errors. 2. I have added some statements to explain the methodology and the full process, hoping to make it more detailed and clear. I admit that the number of samples may insufficient, which is one of the shortcomings of the paper. In further study we will try to expand the scale of samples and improve our design of the research. Thanks for your advice. 3. I have corrected and now only use consumers instead of customers in the whole article to make it more consistent. 4. I have added the number system when referencing within the text. 5. Thank you again!
Optional/General comments		