

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJEBA_95420</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Effect of Influencer Marketing and Content Marketing on Customer Engagement and Purchase Decisions on Followers</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.journalajebea.com/index.php/AJEBA/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b>  No</li> <li>• <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b>  Yes</li> <li>• <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  Little Bit</li> <li>• <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  No</li> <li>• <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  To some extent</li> <li>• <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> </ul> <p><b><u>Additional Comments</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grammar and spelling errors may be found in numerous locations, and their correction is highly necessary. Although I have marked a few grammar mistakes in yellow, it is impossible for me to catch every single one. The author must make the necessary corrections.</li> <li>2. Figure 1 needs to have its visibility quality improved because it is quite hazy.</li> <li>3. Despite Mitra Jawi having 83200 followers, just 204 responders' responses have been received, raising doubts about the final result's veracity. To reduce the mistake in the result's accuracy, broaden the pool of respondents a little bit further.</li> <li>4. The explanations for each portion of the methodology section were quite succinct. They have to proceed.</li> <li>5. Questions about the legitimacy of the outcome, such as the p-value, etc., should be answered.</li> <li>6. More details should be kept for the results section. This section is brief.</li> <li>7. The author should examine some current reviews of similar research publications and make the necessary adjustments in his own paper.</li> <li>8. Create the outcome section taking the discussion section as a guide.</li> <li>9. There must be a full reinterpretation, and some claims must be expressed in clear terms rather than ambiguous ones.</li> <li>10. 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> </ol>	

## Review Form 1.7

	<p>11. A summary of how the work advances the area from the current level of knowledge should 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.</p> <p>12. 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.</p> <p>13. The introduction is supposed to introduce the problem to be solved in this chapter. Are there any existing solutions? Which is the best? What is its main limitations? What does the author hope to achieve? Properly address them in the introduction.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	To some extent	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### **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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

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