

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_97842
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Social Media Marketing Activities of Skincare Brand on Customer Loyalty
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.journalajebo.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> <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. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. 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>1. Yes, the article is relevant due to the approach to the central theme using a statistically constructed model for data processing and understanding of the information generated, providing value to knowledge.</p> <p>2. I suggest you put the following theme - The influence of the brand's social media marketing activities on the customer's perception</p> <p>3. Yes, but it needs to handle the information better to generate knowledge from them. It has content but needs to be better polished.</p> <p>4. Appropriate, I suggest that you include the model designing with the hypotheses proposed in the model studied with the established constructs.</p> <p>Another issue is that he wanted to perceive only the positive impact of the constructs, because when describing them he gave this impression, the ideal is to present: positive, significant, negative significant, still including a factor such as: weak, moderate, strong and perfect.</p> <p>Another thing is to improve the visual way of presenting the data in the tables, ordering them by value, from left to right for a better understanding of the values displayed there.</p> <p>I also suggest drawing up graphics, this helps to give greater notoriety to the work.</p> <p>5. Yes. However, it needs to better present the model, better describe the model, which has been little explored, I suggest that it addresses this aspect as it can contribute to better understanding the adherence of the target audience.</p> <p>Note that he had the following composition as a sample:</p> <p>21 - 25 years 132 60 25 - 30 years 55 25 31 - 35 years 25 11 36 - 40 years 0 0</p> <p>See that the fact that the sample for the public from 31 to 35 reaches a lower range, this is something extremely relevant, as it demonstrates that this public needs to be treated with another form of approach to demonstrate its real adherence, thus seeing the perception of this that the range.</p> <p>The ideal is to show, within the population aspect, the total by age group, see which media have an impact on the public and thus perform a more accurate analysis of what really influences customers.</p> <p>See that the fact of age is not relevant to define whether the 40-year-old sample does not study also contributes, the issue is that there were no potential users who participated in the research.</p> <p>In this way, it would be interesting to direct and point out as an improvement that the company should verify within this target audience the reason for their not participating. In addition to the customer's loyalty to the brand, the way of approaching the customer must consider what he understands as relevant.</p> <p>I believe that the article has the potential, even to be published, as long as the points I raised here in this open discussion for the advancement of knowledge are properly commented.</p> <p>6. Sufficient and adequate</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Ok	
Optional/General comments	Making the indicated adjustments, then going through a review of the conclusion to improve the discussion of the results, I think it is adequate and relevant for science	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leonardo Soares Francisco de Almeida
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brasil