

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_112313
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of E-WOM on Trust Inclination and Information Adoption in the Sociolla Platform
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 work is significant to the scientific community as it tackles an issue that is current and will likely be relevant in the future. The author offers a thorough analysis of the body of research on information adoption and trust inclination in addition to putting out a novel conceptual framework for comprehending the impact of E-WOM. The work adds a great deal to the area and is effectively written and argued.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. It is clear, concise, and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. (I suggested that modify eWOM instead of E-WOM)</p> <p>3. Yes, The article's abstract is rather detailed. It is straightforward and succinct, giving an excellent synopsis of the manuscript's major topics.</p> <p>4. Yes, The manuscript's structure and subsections are suitable. The material is easy to read and is clearly arranged. The subsections are pertinent to the manuscript's primary ideas and have clear labels.</p> <p>5. Yes, The author makes his views in an understandable and rational way, and he backs them up with references to current and pertinent literature.</p> <p>6. The 63 citations are current and adequate. Numerous sources, such as books, journals, and websites, are cited by the author. Additionally, he references several contemporary sources, indicating that he is knowledgeable with the most recent findings in this field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes, The article's language and English quality are appropriate for academic writing. The work is written nicely and is devoid of spelling and punctuation mistakes. The author writes in an understandable and succinct manner.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The text is interesting and well-written. The author offers a fresh conceptual framework for improved comprehension, which significantly advances the field of electronic word-of-mouth communication. It is my recommendation that this work be published in an academic journal.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	R. Mugesh Kannan
Department, University & Country	Syed Hameedha Arts and Science College, India