Review of: "Factors Influencing the Laptop Buying Behavior of Students in Vietnam"

Marietta Kiss[1]

1 University of Debrecen

The abstract should contain the main findings as well. A thorough literature review is missing; you should reveal previous studies examining laptop purchase behavior and those using the theoretical framework you have chosen. This way, you can increase the number of references which is very limited now (you cite only 5 sources). Please, be more careful with citations; in some places they are missing (e.g., in the first paragraphs of sections 2.1, 2.2, and 3.2). How had you chosen the features you examined? You should have referred back to previous research studies that showed these are the most important attributes that are taken into account by students when choosing a laptop; or you should have conducted a previous qualitative/quantitative research to reveal the most important factors. Otherwise your choice seems to be haphazard. I don't understand why "The specification reflects the immediate feelings of consumers." In general, hypotheses are usually inaccurate; e.g., the faculty is mentioned only in 1 hypothesis. Please, be aware that design means aesthetics + functionality together (not only aesthetics). The discussion of the questionnaire design is not related to your questionnaire at all; you did not examine customer care scale, personal connection scale, scale for employee competence, product knowledge scale, and satisfaction scale. Therefore, the design, the source, and the validation of your questionnaire are fully missing. Please, provide more information about the sampling method (on p.5 you state it was random sampling but on p.14 you state it was "convenient random sampling" – in the first case, please, provide more details on how you assured randomness; the secondly mentioned method is not existing). Other demographic information on the sample is needed (e.g., the distribution of the sample according to the schools of respondents). When and exactly where did you conduct the survey? I do not understand the term "total variable" in this context (p.5-6). Please, use more relevant abbreviations for your variables, because it is very difficult to unlock the meanings (e.g., Reference group is TK, whereas RG would be much more logical). I do not understand why the statement "I have a need to buy laptops from the distribution company in large quantities." is related to the Brand factor. In statement GC3, there is a repetition. What you call "buy behavior" or "buying behavior" or even "purchase intent" (i.e., HV) is, in fact, post-purchase behavior or satisfaction (HV1) and loyalty (HV2, HV3); only one variable is related to purchase intent to some extent (HV2) (neither one is related to buying behavior in its narrow sense, in the broad sense, however, everything that is examined in this paper, is an integrated part of buying behavior). Since this is the dependent variable in your examinations, you did not examine what factors influence laptop buying behavior but you examined what factors influence the satisfactions with and loyalty to laptops (alternatively, post-purchase behavior related to laptops). In the light of this, you should reword the whole paper, including its title. You state there are 4 factors based on the Eigenvalues (typo in the text!), but in the rotation matrix you show 7 factors with the original distribution of variables. Please, omit the basic statistical definitions

and explanations (e.g., the detailed discussion of Pearson correlation and t-test). Observation values are unnecessary in Table 5 (because it is 214 in all cases), it is enough to indicate N=214 in the table title or notes. At the beginning of the paper there is only 1 author; however, terms such as "authors," "research team," "authors' team," "team" appear several times in the last third of the paper. Instead of "intimate" relationship, you should use the term "close" relationship. Significance values appearing as 0.000 in SPSS should be reported as $p<0.001$, since p is never zero, but too few decimals are shown by the software. Please, be careful with the consistent use of decimal points or commas. Table 4.13 is, in fact, Table 8. It would be important to highlight that "one-unit change in the perception of technical specification leads to a 0.333-unit increase…" is, in fact, a positive change (or increase). The Discussion section is totally missing; in that section you should compare and contrast your results to previous results. Your practical recommendations are too general and not related to your specific results. On p.14 you write "The study was based solely on factors such as purchase frequency, income, and duration…" but nothing has been mentioned about these factors before, you did not examined them. Please, delete the last paragraph; you should not apologize about the mistakes of your research (you should try to avoid them all) and you should not take a vow to conduct a better research next time. Finally, please, get the manuscript proofread by a professional native English-speaking proofreader.