Review of Futures Markets
ISSN 1933-7116 (Print)
fra.st/rfm

Volume 34 · Issue 2 · 2026
Pages 1557–1567

Customer Experience in Indian Ecommerce A Comparative Qualitative Review of Marketplaces, Quick Commerce and Brand Websites

Abhishek Kumar Mishra*[1], Dr Bhaskar[2], Vivek Kumar Singh Jha[3], Dr Alok Kumar[4]

[1] Assistant Professor, School of Commerce and Management Studies, Sandip University. abhimishra1822@gmail.com

[2] Assistant Professor, School of Commerce and Management Studies, Sandip University. drbhaskarmishra02@gmail.com

[3] Assistant Professor, School of Commerce and Management Studies, Sandip University. viveksinghjha10@gmail.com

[4] Assistant Professor, School of Commerce and Management Studies, Sandip University. ca.alok06@gmail.com

* Corresponding Author: Abhishek Kumar Mishra, abhimishra1822@gmail.com

Received: 08/02/2026 | **Accepted:** 14/09/2026 | **Published:** 22/10/2026

Abstract

Purpose: This article compares customer experience across Indian marketplaces, quick-commerce platforms and brand-owned websites, considering discovery, checkout, fulfilment and recovery. It also distinguishes physical products from time-sensitive services. Method: A bounded qualitative synthesis examines 17 journal articles, prioritising Indian evidence and using selected studies from Indonesia, Brazil and China to clarify mechanisms and channel differences. The studies were grouped by setting, design, journey stage, outcome and limits of inference. Guidance from the Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA) provides policy context but is not counted as journal evidence. Findings: Usability and relevant information help customers complete shopping tasks, whereas satisfaction after checkout also depends on accurate fulfilment, clear responsibility and a fair remedy when something goes wrong. An Indian checkout experiment finds that exposure to three dark patterns increased perceived betrayal, punitive intent and negative word of mouth, while no pattern significantly affected brand trust after a single exposure. Evidence on apps and mobile websites shows channel-specific relationships but does not establish a universally superior format. Contribution: The article sets out comparable questions about task completion, delivery, remedies and observed repeat purchasing. It reports neither a new consumer survey nor a PRISMA-based systematic review or causal comparison of the three business models.

Keywords: customer experience; Indian ecommerce; marketplace; quick commerce; brand website; service recovery; trust; mobile app

1. Introduction

An online purchase does not end when a customer clicks ‘pay’. The shopper may already have compared products and accepted a price, but the seller must still fulfil the order. If the item is wrong or late, the quality of help can affect whether the customer buys again. Customer experience (CX) therefore covers more than the usability of the website or app. Lemon and Verhoef (2016) examine experience throughout the customer journey, while Rose et al. (2012) model antecedents and outcomes of online retail experience. Both draw attention to a sequence of interactions rather than a single screen.

How to cite: Mishra et al. (2026). Customer Experience in Indian Ecommerce A Comparative Qualitative Review of Marketplaces, Quick Commerce and Brand Websites. Review of Futures Markets, 34(2), 1557–1567.
© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Review of Futures Markets.

That sequence takes different forms across Indian digital-commerce models. A marketplace offers products from multiple sellers and enables comparison, while descriptions, fulfilment and remedies may involve separate parties. Quick commerce typically promises delivery from local inventory within a short period, making stock accuracy and timing especially visible. A brand-owned website provides a direct connection to the brand and detailed product information but offers a narrower assortment than many marketplaces. These differences describe how the models organise the service. They do not establish a measured ranking of Indian platforms or imply that every firm within a model operates alike.

Indian studies address parts of this journey. Tandon et al. (2016) examine website functionality, perceived usability and usefulness in online shopping. Chavadi et al. (2019) consider service process, outcome and recovery in Indian e-retailing. More recent papers examine mobile food ordering, a local quick-commerce survey and a controlled checkout experiment (Agrawal & Narayanan, 2026; Ambaliya et al., 2025; Upadhyay et al., 2024). Their samples, platforms, measures and periods differ. None observes the same Indian customers buying comparable products across a marketplace, a quick-commerce platform and a brand website. A comparison must therefore distinguish a published finding from an inference about business-model differences.

The review addresses four questions. Which components of digital CX can be measured across models? How do usability, trust and personalisation relate to satisfaction and intended continued use? Which fulfilment and recovery failures matter after checkout? What can reasonably be compared across business models, device channels, products, services and selected international settings? These questions guide an Indian research agenda without pooling incompatible studies. Each conclusion should match its measure: perceived convenience for a convenience claim, a completed remedy for recovery, and observed subsequent transactions for repeat purchasing.

2. Conceptual Foundations

2.1 The Customer Journey and Electronic Service Quality

A journey perspective separates discovery, evaluation, payment, fulfilment and post-purchase experience. Relevant search results and accurate product information can reduce effort during discovery. At checkout, the total price, payment options, payment confirmation and clarity of charges matter. Fulfilment tests whether the delivered item and timing match what was promised. Recovery begins when a customer reports a problem and ends when the remedy is completed. These stages remain analytically distinct even when they occur in one app session. An easy search cannot compensate fully for an undelivered order, and a competent remedy may not erase all inconvenience caused by the original failure (Lemon & Verhoef, 2016).

Electronic service quality offers measurable dimensions. Parasuraman et al. (2005) identify efficiency, fulfilment, system availability and privacy in E-S-QUAL, alongside a separate recovery scale. Blut (2016) develops a hierarchical model of electronic service quality. For an Indian e-retail study, navigation, order outcomes and support should still be reported separately, even if an overall satisfaction score is calculated. Keeping the components and the timing of measurement visible helps identify whether a low rating reflects the shopping interface, delivery or a post-purchase problem.

2.2 Trust Value and Personalisation

Trust can refer to different parties and promises: the platform's handling of payment, the seller's description, the delivery partner's reliability or the provider's willingness to resolve a complaint. A customer might trust one party while doubting another. This matters especially in a marketplace, where the seller, platform and fulfilment partner may have different responsibilities. Atulkar (2021) examines service quality and repurchase intentions among Indian online shoppers. Candra et al. (2022) study electronic service quality, satisfaction and trust in an Indonesian marketplace. Their findings support investigating links between trustworthy interactions and intended repeat use, but do not establish that each source of trust has the same effect in India.

Perceived value includes the time and risk involved in completing a purchase, as well as the price paid. A recommendation can help a shopper replenish a familiar product, find a known size or discover a relevant alternative. It can also repeat irrelevant items, narrow comparison or make the use of personal data feel intrusive. Wang et al. (2024) examine

recommendation acceptance in relation to perceived benefits and privacy concerns. Their study identifies a design mechanism; it does not measure profit from an Indian recommendation engine. Choosing among numerous sellers on a marketplace differs from exploring the narrower assortment of a brand website.

Satisfaction, trust, intention to continue using a service and actual loyalty are different outcomes. Upadhyay et al. (2024) study more than 400 first-time users of mobile food-ordering apps in India. They report that electronic satisfaction and trust mediate the relationship between online experience and continued-use intention. Intention after a first use is informative, but it is not a record of a second purchase. Assessing profitable retention would require later transactions and the associated promotions, refunds and service costs. The same distinction applies to quick-commerce subscriptions, marketplace accounts and brand websites.

3. Method

3.1 Bounded Selection and Evidence Groups

A targeted search was conducted on 22 September 2026 using publicly available publisher and journal pages, DOI records and institutional sources. Search terms combined online customer experience, electronic service quality, India, quick commerce, marketplaces, mobile apps or websites, trust, loyalty, returns and refunds. Foundational journey and measurement papers were also identified through references. English-language peer-reviewed papers were eligible if they defined a relevant measure, examined a customer-facing digital purchase, addressed fulfilment or recovery, or tested a behavioural outcome. Indian studies were prioritised; selected papers from Indonesia, Brazil and China were retained to clarify a mechanism or channel comparison.

The bounded corpus contains 17 journal articles: four sources on journeys or service quality (Blut, 2016; Lemon & Verhoef, 2016; Parasuraman et al., 2005; Rose et al., 2012); four Indian product e-retail studies (Atulkar, 2021; Chavadi et al., 2019; Kumar & Ayodeji, 2021; Tandon et al., 2016); three Indian food or rapid-delivery studies (Agrawal & Narayanan, 2026; Ambaliya et al., 2025; Upadhyay et al., 2024); and six studies of returns, recommendations or selected comparator settings (Candra et al., 2022; Griffis et al., 2012; Lucas et al., 2023; Mainardes et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024). Page et al. (2021) is cited for reporting guidance but is not counted among the 17. Government documents provide context and are excluded from the journal count.

This is a purposive qualitative review rather than an exhaustive systematic review. The search record does not include a reproducible export of all identified records, a deduplication file, a full-text exclusion log or independent second screening. Search results from public websites may also change. The manuscript therefore reports no PRISMA identification counts or pooled effect. This synthesis compares concepts and reported findings within a selected corpus; it cannot establish the prevalence or average magnitude of the relationships identified.

3.2 Extraction and Appraisal

Sources were classified by geographic setting, purchase context, platform or channel, method, journey stage, measured variable and endpoint. Conceptual papers help define constructs; surveys report associations within their samples; a simulated checkout experiment estimates immediate responses to assigned interfaces; and an archival returns study observes later transactions outside India. These designs support different levels of inference, which were retained during synthesis. No study in this set makes a controlled three-way comparison of Indian marketplaces, quick-commerce platforms and brand websites using one common outcome measure.

A coding matrix grouped observations under information and usability, payment and perceived risk, recommendations, fulfilment, recovery and continued use. For comparisons among models, the review also noted who controls product descriptions, stock, the payment interface, the last-mile promise and the remedy. India's 2023 dark-pattern guidelines and the CCPA's 2025 self-audit advisory provide policy context, rather than peer-reviewed findings or evidence that a platform named in this review violated the rules (Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food & Public Distribution, 2025a). Extensions from one setting to another are identified as inferences. Table 1 summarises the evidence groups and their limits.

Table: 1 Selected Evidence Groups and Limits of Inference

Evidence group	Included studies	What can be concluded
Journey and service measures	Lemon and Verhoef (2016); Rose et al. (2012); Parasuraman et al. (2005); Blut (2016)	Defines CX stages and multidimensional service quality; no matched India model comparison.
Indian product e-retail	Tandon et al. (2016); Chavadi et al. (2019); Atulkar (2021); Kumar and Ayodeji (2021)	Connects site, process and support measures to satisfaction or intended retention in the samples studied.
Indian food and rapid delivery	Upadhyay et al. (2024); Ambaliya et al. (2025); Agrawal and Narayanan (2026)	Adds first-time-user intentions, a local descriptive survey and an experiment on immediate checkout reactions.
Returns and recommendations	Griffis et al. (2012); Wang et al. (2024)	Observed returns behaviour outside India; recommendation acceptance under the designs studied.
International comparator settings	Candra et al. (2022); Lucas et al. (2023); Mainardes et al. (2023); Zhang et al. (2024)	Illustrates marketplace, ethics and device mechanisms; provides no calibrated ranking of countries.

4. Thematic Findings

4.1 Usability and Information

Usability should be judged against the shopper's task. Someone replenishing groceries needs a direct route to a familiar product and an accurate stock indicator. Someone comparing an expensive appliance needs reliable specifications, credible reviews and room to consider alternatives. Tandon et al. (2016) link perceived website functionality, usability and usefulness with satisfaction among Indian online shoppers; Rose et al. (2012) relate online experience to its antecedents and consumer outcomes. These studies do not imply that every extra step is harmful. A comparison screen can improve a considered purchase. The relevant question is whether the intended task can be completed accurately and without unnecessary effort.

Information quality also differs from visual presentation. An attractive product image cannot correct a wrong pack size, and a prominent delivery promise has limited value when stock is unavailable. Chavadi et al. (2019) examine process, outcome and recovery aspects of Indian e-retail service quality, a distinction that helps connect the digital promise with the delivered order. A platform audit could compare the displayed item, seller, full price, fees and delivery window with the order confirmation and what ultimately arrived. This would identify specific error rates rather than relying only on a general rating of trustworthiness.

Customer reviews present a related information problem. A rating may concern the item, the seller or delivery, and an aggregate score can obscure which part of the transaction performed poorly. The selected studies do not quantify the relative importance of these signals for Indian shoppers across the three models. A limited experiment could show the same product with separately labelled product, seller and delivery information, then assess comprehension and choice. Decision accuracy would be a more meaningful test of that information than clicks alone.

Convenience also depends on how an exception is handled. A customer who must repeat a complaint to several support agents before receiving a refund has incurred time and uncertainty after a simple checkout. Kumar and Ayodeji (2021) distinguish customer activation from retention in Indian e-retailing. A smooth first purchase or introductory offer may encourage activation, while continued use depends on the experience after discounts end and when an order goes wrong. The two outcomes should not be treated as interchangeable.

Quick commerce shortens the interval between the information displayed and the service delivered. Ambaliya et al. (2025) surveyed 100 consumers in Anand using purposive sampling. Their paper identifies order accuracy (72%), delivery professionalism (65%) and customer-support responsiveness (72%) as prominent satisfaction factors in that sample. These percentages describe respondents in one city; they are neither national estimates nor causal effects. A useful next step would compare stock and order accuracy, promised and actual arrival times, and customer ratings using the same order-level definitions.

4.2 Trust Price Clarity and Security

Checkout brings several risks together. The shopper needs to know who is selling the item, the full amount due, how payment will be confirmed and where to seek a remedy. A price that rises late in checkout can undermine the value of a seemingly attractive listing. A delayed confirmation after payment can create uncertainty even if the transaction succeeds. Privacy is one dimension of E-S-QUAL, but a privacy score alone cannot describe seller honesty or delivery reliability (Parasuraman et al., 2005). Trust questions should

identify the party and promise to which each answer relates.

Interpretation across studies requires care. Atulkar (2021) examines service-quality dimensions and repurchase intentions in India. Candra et al. (2022) address electronic service quality, trust and satisfaction in Indonesia, while Mainardes et al. (2023) study perceived e-retailer ethics and online customer experience in Brazil. Together, they give reasons to investigate fair conduct as well as technical performance. Their different samples and instruments cannot establish whether security or another factor matters more in one country than in another.

Indian consumer policy makes checkout clarity particularly relevant. The CCPA's 2023 dark-pattern guidelines cover practices including false urgency, basket sneaking and confirm shaming. Its June 2025 advisory asked e-commerce platforms to audit their interfaces for such practices within three months (Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food & Public Distribution, 2025a). The advisory is a policy source, not a measure of customer satisfaction or a finding about any platform examined here. A platform-level study could test whether shoppers understand final fees, urgency claims and consent choices as displayed during a real checkout.

4.3 Personalisation and Recommendation Quality

A recommendation is useful when it helps a customer complete a task. A reminder based on a relevant earlier purchase can simplify replenishment, and a clear size suggestion may reduce uncertainty before ordering. Recommendations can also crowd out alternatives or seem intrusive when customers do not understand how their data were used. Wang et al. (2024) examine the balance between perceived benefits, privacy concerns and recommendation acceptance. Their work supports evaluating relevance, transparency and user control alongside the number of recommendations shown. It is not an Indian experiment comparing marketplaces with brand websites.

The available recommendation choices differ by business model. A marketplace can draw on products from many sellers but must also manage sponsored placement and comparability. A quick-commerce platform can suggest familiar items while accounting for local stock and substitutions. A brand website may explain a recommendation with reference to a customer's earlier direct purchases or a limited product range. These are structural inferences, not measured differences in customer outcomes. An Indian experiment could compare opt-in and default recommendations for the same shopping task, disclose why items are shown and assess task success, perceived intrusion and unwanted purchases or returns. Acceptance alone would not demonstrate a better experience.

Consent also depends on how a recommendation appears. A customer who chooses to open a saved shopping list may understand why earlier purchases are visible, whereas a new visitor shown personal suggestions may be less certain about the data used. Wang et al. (2024) provide a framework for examining the perceived benefit and privacy risk of personalisation. An Indian study could disclose the information behind each suggestion, provide a genuine preference choice and measure comprehension separately from acceptance. It should test whether the recommendation assists the shopper's task, rather than assume that more personalisation always improves CX.

4.4 Delivery and Recovery

Fulfilment tests promise made before payment. A parcel can arrive late, damaged or unlike its listing. A grocery order may be timely but incomplete, while a correctly prepared meal can be delayed during delivery. These are different failures with different consequences. Chavadi et al. (2019) examine process, outcome and recovery quality in Indian e-retailing, helping to distinguish a smooth ordering process from the handling of a later complaint. Ambaliya et al. (2025) identify support responsiveness as salient in their local quick-commerce survey. Neither an attractive delivery badge nor a fast support response by itself corrects repeated fulfilment errors.

Evaluating recovery requires a record of the failure, the customer's report, the remedy offered and the time to final resolution. Griffis et al. (2012) study returns and later purchasing with transaction data from an online retailer outside India. Observed transactions provide a stronger measure of subsequent behaviour than a hypothetical intention, but findings from returnable goods cannot simply be transferred to perishable meals or missed services. A wrong grocery item may call for prompt replacement, while a damaged appliance may require reverse logistics. A single 'complaint resolved' indicator conceals these differences.

A fair remedy need not be identical for every failure. A defective item may warrant a full refund; a small credit may be inadequate when an urgent order never arrives. A survey can ask whether customers regard the remedy as proportionate to the harm, while operational records can show when the promised remedy was completed. A closed support ticket is not necessarily evidence that the customer was satisfied or received usable compensation. To assess later purchasing, researchers should compare similar failures and account for the possibility that more severe cases receive larger remedies. Otherwise, a simple comparison of remedy size and retention may mislead.

A short delivery promise makes delay and substitution especially consequential when the order is urgent. A twenty-minute delay, or a substitute item sent without clear consent, could remove the reason a customer chose quick commerce. This is an inference from the service proposition and the local evidence on accuracy and support; the review does not quantify losses from any particular delay. A stronger Indian study would record promised and actual times, the reason for substitution, the customer's acceptance, the completed remedy and any later purchase. Those measures could separate immediate dissatisfaction from subsequent behaviour.

4.5 Dark Patterns and Later Behaviour

Agrawal and Narayanan (2026) randomly assigned Indian quick-commerce users to a simulated checkout with either a control interface or one of three dark patterns: basket sneaking, false scarcity or confirm shaming. After a single exposure, all three patterns increased perceived betrayal, punitive intent and negative word of mouth. False scarcity produced the strongest negative reactions. None significantly changed brand trust, and only confirm shaming produced a small decrease in measured loyalty. The result is more specific than a claim that one deceptive screen necessarily destroys trust. The experiment measures immediate self-reported responses; it does not observe later transactions or a platform-wide conversion effect.

The experiment and CCPA guidance address related but distinct questions. The experiment estimates immediate responses to three interface designs under controlled conditions. The guidance covers a wider range of practices and asks platforms to inspect live interfaces. A managerial audit could check whether scarcity claims reflect actual availability, whether fees or extra items are added during checkout, and whether consent choices are genuine. It could then follow subsequent complaints and purchasing to test whether any short-term conversion gain accompanies reduced repeat use. That longitudinal comparison is a proposed study, not a finding of Agrawal and Narayanan (2026).

4.6 Loyalty and Customer Value

Intention to reuse an app is a useful short-term outcome, but it does not count later orders. Upadhyay et al. (2024) report that electronic satisfaction and trust mediate the relationship between online experience and continued-use intention among first-time Indian mobile food-app users. Their study does not observe the complete future purchase histories of all Indian platform customers. A follow-up study should define the observation period, product category and realistic opportunity to repurchase, then distinguish repeat transactions sustained by promotions from those made without them. A person who buys a category only occasionally should not be labelled disloyal merely because no purchase appears within a short quarter.

Customer value requires a further step beyond the count of repeat transactions. The contribution from a repeat order may be small when discounts, refunds, returns and support are costly. Conversely, a costly but fair remedy may preserve a valuable customer relationship. Future research could compare matched customer cohorts using both retention and net contribution after service costs. The papers in this corpus do not calculate this outcome consistently across all three Indian business models. A return on investment from improved CX is therefore a testable proposition with several intermediate steps, not a figure established by this review.

5. Comparative Analysis

5.1 Marketplaces Quick Commerce and Brand Websites

The three models organise choice and accountability differently. A marketplace generally offers broad assortment, competing sellers and customer reviews. It can make product comparison easier, but responsibility for an incorrect listing or return may be less clear to the customer. Quick commerce uses local inventory and a short delivery promise; stock accuracy, picking and arrival time are central to that proposition. A brand-owned website can offer detailed product information

and direct support, although its narrower range may limit independent comparison. These are features of the models, not evidence that one of them has the highest customer-experience score in India.

Responsibility should be traced across the whole transaction. A marketplace can set listing rules while a seller supplies the item, and a separate carrier delivers it. A brand can sell directly but outsource fulfilment. A quick-commerce service can coordinate local inventory, pickers and riders behind one app. The customer may see only one order screen. A meaningful comparison should identify who made each promise, who could remedy a failure and how clearly the customer was told where to seek help. A chatbot's response time alone does not capture the quality of that remedy.

Table 2: Comparable Experience Questions Across Three Business Models

Journey stage	Marketplace	Quick commerce	Brand website
Discover	Seller and review credibility; breadth	Local stock; easy reorder	Detailed brand product information
Commit	Seller identity; full landed price	Basket clarity; credible time promise	Fees, payment assurance and order confirmation
Fulfil	Seller, carrier and platform coordination	Item accuracy, substitution and handoff	Stock and outsourced carrier performance
Recover	Return responsibility and escalation	Prompt replacement or credit	Direct support and return route
Retain	Choice across sellers and repeat category purchases	Convenient repeat use without persistent error	Repeat direct purchase and relationship costs

Table 2 provides comparable questions, not scores. Actual platform arrangements vary: some marketplaces run their own logistics, and some brand websites display extensive third-party reviews. Customers considering an expensive appliance may place particular weight on inspection and returns, whereas shoppers buying routine groceries may prioritise availability and timely delivery. The framework should therefore be adapted to the platform and product category before it becomes a questionnaire. A business-model label cannot substitute for what a customer experienced during a specific order.

5.2 Mobile Apps and Websites

Device channel is separate from business model. A marketplace or brand can operate through both an app and a website. An app may save preferences and make repeat ordering easier; mobile web is available without installation and may suit an occasional comparison. Lucas et al. (2023) compare experience across access platforms in Brazil. Zhang et al. (2024) use click and purchase data from a Chinese retailer to examine direct and indirect sales through an app and mobile website. These studies show why channel should be measured alongside customer history and shopping task. Neither establishes a universal app-versus-website ranking for India.

A simple comparison of app users with website visitors can be misleading. Frequent buyers may install an app because they already know the retailer, whereas first-time shoppers may begin on mobile web. Higher retention among app users would then partly reflect selection, not necessarily a better interface. A stronger test would ask the same customers to perform comparable tasks across channels where feasible, holding assortment and price constant. It could measure completion, errors, perceived control and later purchases. This is a proposed research design, not a result inferred from the international studies.

5.3 Physical Products and Time Sensitive Services

Physical goods can be checked after delivery for quantity, condition and consistency with a listing. Depending on the category, a return can correct a poor fit or defect. Quality in an on-demand service or prepared meal is more tightly bound to time: a late meal cannot always be made useful by issuing a refund. Upadhyay et al. (2024) examine first-time food-app users and their intention to continue using the service, whereas Griffis et al. (2012) analyse actual returns and later transactions for an online product retailer. The studies illuminate different recovery endpoints and should not be treated as measuring the same outcome.

Complaint categories should be paired with appropriate endpoints. A faulty appliance, substituted grocery item and delayed meal differ in their remedies and time sensitivity. The promised remedy and the elapsed time to completion should be recorded separately. Comparing the raw percentage of 'resolved tickets'

across a marketplace and a food service could conceal differences in the severity of failures and what counts as resolution. Customer surveys can assess perceived fairness; order and support logs can show whether a refund or credit was received and whether the customer purchased again. Together, those sources offer a fuller account of recovery.

5.4 India and Selected Comparator Economies

The Indonesian study contributes evidence on marketplace service quality, trust and satisfaction (Candra et al., 2022). Brazilian studies address retailer ethics and experience across access platforms (Lucas et al., 2023; Mainardes et al., 2023). Zhang et al. (2024) provide observed app and mobile-website click and purchase data for a Chinese retailer. Indian studies cover website usability, e-retail service, food ordering and selected quick-commerce questions. This range helps identify mechanisms for future Indian research. Because the studies use different measures, samples, categories and periods, their estimates cannot rank countries by customer experience or trust.

Table 3: Cross Market Sources and Permissible Comparisons

Setting	Observed focus	Permissible transfer
India	Site satisfaction, e-retail service, food app continued use and quick commerce checkout or fulfilment	Locally relevant mechanisms; no matched comparison of the three models.
Indonesia	Marketplace service quality, trust and satisfaction	A conceptually similar relationship for further Indian testing.
Brazil	Retailer ethics and customer experience on different access channels	Relevant constructs; no country difference estimate.
China	App and mobile website click and purchase data at one retailer	Shows measurable channel sales pathways; does not estimate an Indian effect.

6. Discussion and Implications

6.1 A Dashboard for Experience Measurement

The synthesis suggests a compact group of measures organised by journey stage. Discovery can be assessed through task completion, search relevance and accuracy of product information. Checkout measures should capture the full price, payment errors, consent clarity and confirmation. Fulfilment requires item accuracy, condition, substitutions and promised versus actual delivery times. Recovery needs measures of access to help, first response, decision, completed remedy and perceived fairness. Where privacy permissions allow, these records should be linked at the order level. A platform could then see whether an improvement in checkout completion coincides with more delivery complaints or slower refunds.

Comparisons need defined denominators and time periods. The complaint rate should be calculated per comparable set of fulfilled orders, since the count of complaints can rise when orders grow even if the rate is stable. Delivery timeliness should be assessed against the promise made to that customer, not one universal time limit for different services. Refund time should run from the customer's first valid report to receipt of usable funds or credit, rather than to an internal 'approved' status. Repeat purchasing should be assessed over a period in which customers have a realistic opportunity to buy again. These definitions make managerial comparisons clearer and research results easier to reproduce.

A dashboard should display distributions as well as averages. An acceptable average delivery time may conceal a group of very late orders, and high mean satisfaction may coexist with serious failures for particular customers. Median performance and appropriate tail measures by city, product category and business model would show where problems persist. Before-and-after comparisons should also note changes in staffing, payment systems, promotions or fulfilment capacity. Otherwise, a change attributed to the interface might partly reflect a simultaneous operational change.

CCPA guidance adds a question about whether displayed choices are honest. Its June 2025 advisory requested platform self-audits; a November 2025 government release reported that 26 platforms had submitted self-declarations after internal or third-party reviews (Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food & Public Distribution, 2025a, 2025b). These declarations are neither independent comparative CX scores nor a guarantee of continued compliance. A practical audit could inspect live checkout screens for the basis of urgency claims, preselected options, added items and when charges become visible. Agrawal and Narayanan (2026) provide evidence of immediate customer responses to three such design patterns, but

not their long-term effect on purchasing.

6.2 Designing a Stronger Indian Comparison

Future research could sample customers in several Indian cities across all three business models. The design should identify comparable product categories and distinguish first-time from experienced buyers. A short transaction-specific survey could measure information quality, perceived control, trust in the responsible parties, remedy fairness and satisfaction. With appropriate consent and access, order records could provide item accuracy, full charges, timestamps, substitutions, support contacts, completed remedies and subsequent purchases. Even if firms cannot share raw data, common definitions and a documented sampling plan would permit more defensible comparisons than unrelated convenience samples.

The comparison should reflect the customer's actual task. One participant might replenish a familiar household item; another might compare alternatives for a considered purchase. Where feasible, the same participant could complete balanced tasks on mobile web and an app. For live transactions, a quasi-experimental design could follow a change in fee disclosure or support routing against an appropriate comparison group. A retention analysis would need sufficient follow-up time and adjustments for discounts and purchase frequency. Such studies could test the mechanisms suggested here; the present review has not conducted those comparisons.

Before modelling relationships, researchers should test whether questionnaire items have the same meaning across sampled languages, devices and customer groups. Trust questions should specify whether they refer to the merchant, platform, delivery partner or payment process. Only customers who encountered a problem can assess actual recovery; customers without one may evaluate the clarity of the stated policy instead. The measures should then be tested for reliability and comparability across groups. Otherwise, a difference between models may arise because a question refers to different actors or experiences in each setting.

Translation should retain the same actor and purchase stage in each question. 'Seller trust', for example, may be interpreted differently when the platform owns the inventory and when independent merchants provide it. Researchers should report how respondents accessed each channel, the product categories they purchased and the composition of each sample before interpreting score differences. The international studies in this review can help refine measures and hypotheses; attributing unmatched differences to national culture would exceed what their designs support.

6.3 Limits of the Present Synthesis

The 17 papers were selected through a bounded public search. Some findings could be checked against full texts, while publisher abstracts were used where full texts were unavailable; appraisal depth therefore varies. The review has no study-level risk-of-bias scoring or comprehensive PRISMA flow. The Indian quick-commerce evidence includes a small purposive survey and an experiment measuring immediate self-reports. Evidence directly about brand-owned websites within the Indian comparison is thinner. The study set does not provide a matched three-way comparison. Archival returns data and international channel studies suggest useful measures, but their findings cannot be treated as Indian comparative estimates.

Business model and device channel also overlap in practice. A brand may sell through a quick-delivery service and a marketplace as well as its own website; a marketplace may operate a fulfilment network. The review therefore focuses on who owns each promise and transaction stage rather than assuming that one label captures the whole experience. Usability, price clarity, delivery and recovery may affect satisfaction together. This synthesis identifies plausible mechanisms and measurement questions but cannot estimate their separate causal contributions without primary comparative data.

7. Conclusion

Customer experience spans discovery, checkout, fulfilment and recovery. The selected studies connect information quality, service reliability, trust and perceived fairness with satisfaction or intended continued use in particular settings. Ambaliya et al. (2025) describe satisfaction factors among 100 quick-commerce users in Anand; Agrawal and Narayanan (2026) show that three deceptive checkout designs increased immediate perceived betrayal and negative word of mouth, but did not significantly change brand trust after a single exposure. These findings do not rank Indian business models or channels. A matched study using comparable tasks, verified orders, completed remedies and later transactions is needed to test

whether differences in experience persist in observed purchasing behaviour.

Declarations

Ethics approval: Not applicable; this review used published sources and recruited no participants. Data availability: No new participant dataset was created. The cited sources are listed in the references.

References

Agrawal, S., & Narayanan, S. (2026). When design deceives: Consumer reactions to dark patterns in quick commerce. *Journal of Indian Business Research, 18*(2), 37–54. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIBR-05-2025-0188

Ambaliya, A. L., Makwana, A. K., Gurjar, M. D., Kamani, K. C., & Prajapati, M. C. (2025). Customer satisfaction toward quick commerce. *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports, 31*(7), 523–533. https://doi.org/10.9734/jsrr/2025/v31i73269

Atulkar, S. (2021). Service quality dimensions and repurchase intentions in online shopper: An Indian experience. *International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management, 33*(2), 180–197. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPQM.2021.115710

Blut, M. (2016). E-service quality: Development of a hierarchical model. *Journal of Retailing, 92*(4), 500–517. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2016.09.002

Candra, S., Tulangow, C. E., & Winalda, F. T. (2022). A preliminary study of consumer behavior from the online marketplace in Indonesia. *International Journal of Asian Business and Information Management, 13*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJABIM.297846

Chavadi, C. A., Menon, S. R., & Sirothiya, M. (2019). Measuring service quality perceptions of Indian e-retailers: An evaluative study. *Metamorphosis, 18*(2), 92–102. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972622519886232

Griffis, S. E., Rao, S., Goldsby, T. J., & Niranjan, T. T. (2012). The customer consequences of returns in online retailing: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Operations Management, 30*(4), 282–294. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2012.02.002

Kumar, V., & Ayodeji, O. G. (2021). E-retail factors for customer activation and retention: An empirical study from Indian e-commerce customers. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 59*, 102399. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2020.102399

Lemon, K. N., & Verhoef, P. C. (2016). Understanding customer experience throughout the customer journey. *Journal of Marketing, 80*(6), 69–96. https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.15.0420

Lucas, G. A., Lunardi, G. L., & Dolci, D. B. (2023). From e-commerce to m-commerce: An analysis of the user's experience with different access platforms. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications, 58*, 101240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2023.101240

Mainardes, E. W., Coutinho, A. R. S., & Alves, H. M. B. (2023). The influence of the ethics of e-retailers on online customer experience and customer satisfaction. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 70*, 103171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2022.103171

Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food & Public Distribution. (2025a, June 7). Central Consumer Protection Authority issues advisory to e-commerce platforms for self-audit within 3 months to detect dark patterns and ensure its resolution. Press Information Bureau. https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2134765&lang=2&reg=48

Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food & Public Distribution. (2025b, November 20). 26 leading e-commerce platforms declare compliance with self-audit to eliminate dark patterns. Press Information Bureau. https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2191948&lang=2&reg=48

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ, 372*, n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Malhotra, A. (2005). E-S-QUAL: A multiple-item scale for assessing electronic service quality. *Journal of Service Research, 7*(3), 213–233. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670504271156

Rose, S., Clark, M., Samouel, P., & Hair, N. (2012). Online customer experience in e-retailing: An empirical model of antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Retailing, 88*(2), 308–322. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2012.03.001

Tandon, U., Kiran, R., & Sah, A. N. (2016). Customer satisfaction using website functionality, perceived usability and perceived usefulness towards online shopping in India. *Information Development, 32*(5), 1657–1673. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266666915621106

Upadhyay, Y., Baber, R., Paul, J., Baber, P., & Cain, L. (2024). Beyond the first bite: Understanding how online experience shapes user loyalty in the mobile food app market. *Electronic Commerce Research, 24*(2), 799–823. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10660-024-09833-6

Wang, Y., Zhu, J., Liu, R., & Jiang, Y. (2024). Enhancing recommendation acceptance: Resolving the personalization–privacy paradox in recommender systems: A privacy calculus perspective. *International Journal of Information Management, 76*, 102755. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2024.102755

Zhang, X., Wang, F., & Cao, X. (2024). Choose a mobile application or mobile website? Different effects of mobile channels on direct and indirect sales. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 81*, 104060. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2024.104060