

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_98123</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Analysis of Social Media Marketing Activity, Relationship Equity, and Loyalty: Studies on consumers using Indonesian beauty products, Somethinc</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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:

(<https://www.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> Yes</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> Yes</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> Yes</li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> No</li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> No</li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> To some extent</li> </ol> <p>By taking into account the current trend of digital marketing and digital consumer attraction for online purchasing, the proposed research paper appears to be fascinating. In an effort to assess various online Indonesian beauty items, the author makes an effort. But, when I read this research paper, I saw several errors, such as the author's failure to keep the research paper consistent throughout. The author did not define the outcomes of the tables; instead, they were just used to evaluate data using various testing paradigms like P-value, t-value, and others. Because the computed findings are not classified as true or invalid based on the six hypotheses set out, the author is misleading. The author repeatedly uses phrases like "relationships of entertainment, interaction, trendiness, customization, and electronic word-of-mouth" throughout the whole study report. The opening part that the author suggests is not well-written. The author inserted all author lists in one phrase, such as "[7, 8, 9, 10, 11], since they had not thoroughly read the relevant most recent research publications. The author needs comparative analysis and data gathered via Google Forms for the results section. The author wants the most recent research papers that match to the suggested research paper for the reference section. The author rushed through the writing of this research work. The author has to take some time to reevaluate and revise this suggested research study in light of the standing of this research publication. For a readership that is appealing and simple comprehension, use graphical comparative analysis.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The suggested research paper's topic is really intriguing; however, the information is not presented in an engaging manner.</li> <li>2. By organizing it in an engaging way, author research may make the information fascinating.</li> <li>3. Every item of information has been kept as brief as possible; it now has to be expanded.</li> <li>4. There are several sentences that need to be eliminated since they keep repeating themselves.</li> <li>5. The data gathering procedure is not included in the Materials and Methods section.</li> <li>6. There is no mention of the amount of data that was gathered or the method used to turn it.</li> <li>7. According to the journal, research papers are not maintained.</li> <li>8. Expanding the scope of the data gathered might add interest to a research article.</li> <li>9. The explanations for each portion of the methodology section were quite succinct. They have to proceed.</li> <li>10. More details should be kept for the results section. This section is brief.</li> <li>11. The author should examine some current reviews of similar research publications and make the necessary adjustments in his own paper.</li> <li>12. There must be a full reinterpretation, and some claims must be expressed in clear terms rather than ambiguous ones.</li> <li>13. Sentences that don't fit the research have been used in a few paragraphs. Remove these and replace them with research-related sentences. Keep the paragraphs in order so that the reader can make adjustments because the order is disorganized as well.</li> <li>14. A summary of how the work advances the area from the current level of knowledge should</li> </ol>	

## Review Form 1.7

	have been included in the conclusion. In the conclusion section, the author should clearly justify the effort and, if relevant, mention any uses or extensions. 15. When discussing the implications that may be made from this research paper work, for instance, there is no coherence between the abstract and the research paper's substance. 16. The introduction is supposed to introduce the problem to be solved in this chapter. Are there any existing solutions? Which is the best? What are its main limitations? What does the author hope to achieve? Properly address them in the introduction.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Need paraphrasing	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Serious revision expecting	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shyam R. Sihare</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dr. APJ Abdul Kalam Government College, India</b>