

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_127427
Title of the Manuscript:	The Synergistic Effects of Brand Ambassadors, Taglines, and Jingles on E-commerce Brand Awareness: A Case Study of Tokopedia
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
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.	The manuscript is relevant to marketing practitioners and organizations seeking to gain customer patronage and loyalty using brand ambassador and endorsement strategies. It also resonates the current trend of youth's viral engagement of the social media space. Therefore, I like the manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes, the abstract is apt However, am a bit concerned about the choice of keywords.  <b>Keywords: brand ambassador, tagline, jingle advertising, brand awareness</b> These are all words already in the title. Key words are best sourced from within/ the body of the work, and not necessarily title. The essence is for search engine to be familiar with more words when your work is searched online. The title automatically passes that test so no need bringing words in the title up again as key words. e.g. Consumer recall, Celebrity marketing, etc. are some of the words that may be suitable.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	The methodology adopted is appropriate. The theoretical framework is equally well detailed. And then, the author did a good job in proof reading to ensure no typos	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Yes. However, there's need for improvement and correction on the referencing pattern especially if the author is adopting the recent version of APA referencing style (APA 7 <sup>th</sup> ed.) Author name, book title, journal title, etc. should conform with APA 7	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is commendable. The author did a good job in all. There is no major revision. However, the references need thorough correction Also, the use of bullet does not apply here except for books	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Zorbari-Nwitambu, Bright</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kenule Beeson Saro-Wiwa Polytechnic, Nigeria</b>