

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_105364
Title of the Manuscript:	The Influence of Beauty Influencers in Recommending Halal Cosmetics: Examining Their Impact on Engagement, Expected Value, and Purchase Intention
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:

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

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4.</p> <p>5. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>6. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>7. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>not comprehensive, occupied by only the introduction and results.</p> <p>There is a lot of space to modify the article. Literature is better to add to the introduction or discussion. It's better to cut short the introduction. It's better to increase the discussion. It is better to write in paragraphs, particularly the conclusion.</p> <p>Yes, the stats are very good.</p> <p>It's better to check the 1 and 2 reference formats; some are missing doi.</p> <p>Keywords are better to be in MeSH terms in alphabetical order, other than title words.</p> <p>Sample size is better for mention.</p> <p>What are the measures taken to avoid bias? Who prepared the questionnaire, and who was involved in asking it?</p> <p>An image reference, if present, is better to mention.</p> <p>It is preferable to write 'name' in the second reference in the introduction. A web link is better mentioned in the reference section.</p> <p>Consent and ethical clearance are better mentioned.</p> <p>Any confounding factors, like education, should be mentioned.</p> <p>what type of study is a must in methodology.</p> <p>Overall, nice hard work.</p> <p>if possible Compare other studies on statistics in the discussion.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>better to improve quality, and particularly fluency, which is lacking.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rakesh Kotha
Department, University & Country	Niloufer Hospital, India