

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_96028
Title of the Manuscript:	Building WOM from Hedonic Experience of Social Media
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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Not so, therefore, please find, state and write a strong novelty. Yes but it does not have something new that can invites scientific community to read Yes Yes Yes, but the manuscript still needs many relevant studies to support authors' justification and to make it different from the previous studies. This suggestion must also be conducted by the authors to build two mediating hypotheses of the manuscript. Authors should specially illustrate the technique to take the samples of study. Even the sentence "The questionnaire was posted on Wenxing in November 2022 and forwarded to Wechat and Weibo friend groups for recruiting respondents" still need more elaboration. What is wenxing and weibo. Both still sound unfamiliar for many readers I think. At conclusion section, please write back the objective of the study, theoretical and practical implications. Yes they are sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Please explain why the novel aspect of your study is interesting from both an academic and a societal viewpoint (see, e.g., Grant & Pollock, 2011).	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hendra Riofita
Department, University & Country	State Islamic University of Sultan, Indonesia