

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_127102
Title of the Manuscript:	Confession of A Shopaholic: The Purchase Decision Behavior of Generation Z
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The author has explored social media marketing and influencer marketing simultaneously with Gen Z. It is a unique article, and several rigorous tests were employed, such as validity, reliability, normality, multicollinearity, heteroscedasticity, multiple linear regression, etc. The author has concluded that social media and influencer marketing had an influence on purchase decisions. Thus, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. It is a well-analyzed and well-written article.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, the title of the article is relevant and suitable	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The author established the validity and reliability of the data. A normality test was also conducted, and the data are normal. Multicollinearity was also tested. The data was tested for heteroscedasticity. The sample size is good (100 samples). Sampling technique: purposive sampling was suitable for the study. Thus, the manuscript is scientifically sound and correct.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes, the references are sufficient, and recent	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, the language is suitable for scholarly communications. Minor typing errors could be avoided. One such example is "64.8%" instead of "64.8%" coma is used instead of decimal points throughout the article. "2. material and methods" should be in capital letters.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Good work! Well-written article. Avoid typing errors.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>K. Sindhura</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>MEASI Institute of Management, India</b>