

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_71181
Title of the Manuscript:	Consumers' Post-purchase Regret Determinants in Sri Lankan Shopping Malls
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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>Note: Although the topic is not new but in different geographical locations, research on post purchase regret and customer behaviour identification is always useful to implement different techniques to give customer satisfaction. As customer behaviour and satisfaction is ongoing process and always changes as per environment conditions change.</p> <p>I liked the study. I have some suggestion to the author if they can implement the connect of the paper so that more readers would get enriched with provided information. It will also enhance the quality of the paper.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sequence of introduction is not proper, in paragraph 14- explanation about customer satisfaction and in para 18 explanation about customer got written. Explain about customer first and then about customer satisfaction. 2. During introduction, about the topic, in-between para 17 explained about the research gap and objective. Objective or gap should be at the end of the Introduction (if you want to explain). (Always explain the topic in introduction from starting to ending point of the title) then explain gap and objective of the study. 3. Reference line 207 and 226 are same and talking about same paper. Line 198 is also same title with journal name. Author should check and use any one because all are same papers' references. 4. Reference line 195 is not related with the study. 5. Line 193 title of the paper is not mentioned. 6. Also many corrections in references are there for example like reference line 7,8,12 etc. References are not in order and proper format as per guidelines. 7. Para 178 sarsani [41] is mentioned and in references spelling is different.(Pls check which is correct.) 8. Citation Style is different in some places in introduction, using name only in some places. (use same pattern in full paper either numbers of references or name, as per the guidelines) 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Spelling corrections are required. Show the factor analysis related table of rotated matrix.</p> <p>Use first letter in capital everywhere heading/ Subheadings/ new sentences Give some References related to Research Methodology.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Satnam Kaur Ubeja
Department, University & Country	Prestige Institute of Management and Research, India