

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_99616
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Influencer and Endorsement Content on Consumer 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 (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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides insights into the influence of Instagram influencers on consumer behavior. The study uses a quantitative approach to examine the relationship between variables and presents findings that can contribute to the existing literature on social media marketing.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) The title of the article is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The abstract of the article is comprehensive as it summarizes the purpose, methods, and results of the study in a clear and concise manner.</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate as they follow a logical flow and effectively present the research findings.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Based on the information presented in the manuscript, it appears to be scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. The references appear to be sufficient and recent. However, depending on the specific research question, additional recent references may be needed more.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article seem suitable for scholarly communications. The writing is clear and concise.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The Reviewer's comment suggests "Minor Revision" for this article. Overall, the manuscript seems to be well-written and structured, with a clear research aim, methodology, and results. However, there are some minor revisions that could be made to enhance the manuscript further.</p> <p>Firstly, it would be helpful to provide more contexts and background information regarding the research topic and the significance of the study. This could be achieved by incorporating a literature review section at the beginning of the manuscript.</p> <p>Secondly, there could be more details provided regarding the sampling technique and the criteria for selecting the respondents. The study could benefit from a larger sample size. While a sample size of 180 is small, increasing the number of respondents could increase the study's generalizability and statistical power. It would be helpful to include a more detailed description of the sampling method used. For example, how were the respondents recruited and how were they determined to meet the predetermined criteria?</p> <p>Thirdly, it would be useful to provide a more in-depth discussion of the results, particularly in relation to previous studies in the field. The implications and limitations of the study could also be discussed in more detail. It would be interesting to explore the impact of different types of influencers (e.g., micro-influencers vs. macro-influencers) on advertising value and consumer purchase intentions. This could provide valuable insights for marketers and advertisers.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	Finally, some minor grammatical errors could be corrected to improve the overall readability of the manuscript. It would be helpful to acknowledge any potential limitations of the study, such as social desirability bias or the fact that the study was conducted in Indonesia, which may limit its generalizability to other cultural contexts.	
--	---	--

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:	Hsiu-Jung Chou
Department, University & Country	Cheng Shiu University, Taiwan