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| PART 1: Review Comments | | |
| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript offers valuable insights into the challenges consumers face in electronic contracts, with a focus on South African consumer protection laws. Its analysis of fairness-based approaches and consumer awareness highlights crucial gaps in current legislation, making it relevant for legal and consumer protection scholars. This research fills a knowledge gap, especially in developing regions, and can help improve regulatory policies to safeguard consumers.  Suggestion for Improvement: Consider expanding the discussion of how this research contributes to the scientific community by linking it to specific, existing studies or indicating how it addresses gaps that previous research missed. This will strengthen the manuscript's relevance to the field. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The current title, "Consumer Perspectives on Electronic Contract Challenges and the Implications of Selected Consumer Legislation," is mostly suitable. However, a more precise alternative could be: "Challenges in Electronic Contracts: South African Consumer Perspectives and Legislative Implications."  Suggestion for Improvement: Choose a title that specifies both the region (South Africa) and the scope (challenges in electronic contracts). This enhances precision and makes the manuscript’s focus immediately clear to potential readers. |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract effectively summarizes the study's purpose, methods, and findings. However, adding more detail on the specific consumer rights examined and the primary legislative acts analyzed (CPA and ECTA) would enhance clarity and draw readers’ attention to key study components.  Suggestion for Improvement: Include the main legal acts discussed (CPA and ECTA) and a brief mention of key consumer rights covered in the study. This addition would provide a clearer picture for readers scanning the abstract. |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | The manuscript is well-structured, with a clear organization of sections covering the introduction, literature review, and methodology. Each subsection flows logically, aiding comprehension. Including subsections on practical implications for consumers or recommendations might further enhance the paper’s impact.  Suggestion for Improvement: Add a subsection within the discussion or conclusion to outline practical recommendations for consumers or policymakers. This would add actionable insights, increasing the paper's appeal to a broader audience beyond academia. |  |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript is scientifically sound, supported by extensive references and empirical data. It utilizes a mixed-method approach that strengthens its findings through data triangulation. The study’s reliance on South African legal frameworks provides valuable specificity and demonstrates methodological rigor, making its conclusions both reliable and actionable.  Suggestion for Improvement: Ensure that the data analysis methods, particularly the factor analysis, are clearly explained. Adding visuals, like graphs or tables, would aid in presenting complex data more effectively. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | The references are adequate and generally recent, although a few more recent studies on electronic contracts and consumer protection from 2022-2023 could add depth. Including additional literature on international e-commerce legislation comparisons may also benefit the analysis.  Suggestion for Improvement: Integrate recent studies from 2022-2023 on consumer protection in electronic contracts, especially comparing international perspectives. This will contextualize the study within global trends and highlight its relevance to broader issues. |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication but could be improved in some areas for readability and conciseness. A review focusing on simplifying complex sentences would be beneficial.  Conduct a thorough language and grammar review, especially focusing on reducing sentence length and complexity. Simplifying terminology and using active voice where possible will improve readability for a broader audience. |  |
| Optional/General comments | Overall, this manuscript is a significant contribution to consumer rights literature in the digital economy. Minor revisions for language clarity and additional recent references would further strengthen its scholarly impact.  Suggestion for Improvement: Enhancing the clarity of the conclusion by summarizing main findings and recommendations in bullet points could improve the manuscript’s impact and readability for policymakers and industry stakeholders. |  |
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