

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_95602
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of consumer evaluation on online social media platforms: the fashion industry
Type of the Article	Review 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.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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Yes 2. Is the title of the article suitable? Yes 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? No 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? No 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. To some extent <p><u>Additional Comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. The suggested research paper's topic is really intriguing; however, the information is not presented in an engaging manner. 8. By organizing it in an engaging way, author research may make the information fascinating. 9. Every item of information has been kept as brief as possible; it now has to be expanded. 10. There are several sentences that need to be eliminated since they keep repeating themselves. 11. The data gathering procedure is not included in the Materials and Methods section. 12. There is no mention of the amount of data that was gathered or the method used to turn it into big data. 13. There are grammatical errors everywhere, and they must be fixed. 14. According to the journal, research papers are not maintained. 15. Expanding the scope of the data gathered might add interest to a research article. 16. Very little explanation of Section 4.3 has been provided, and the outcome has not been fully analyzed. 17. Apply the concepts from Sections 4.1 and 4.2 as well as the research articles that are relevant to them in your own work. 18. The explanations for each portion of the methodology section were quite succinct. They have to proceed. 19. More details should be kept for the results section. This section is brief. 20. The author should examine some current reviews of similar research publications and make the necessary adjustments in his own paper. 21. Create the outcome section taking the discussion section as a guide. 22. There must be a full reinterpretation, and some claims must be expressed in clear terms rather than ambiguous ones. 23. 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. 24. 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. 25. 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. 26. 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. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly 	No	

Review Form 1.7

communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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