Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies**
Manuscript Number:	**Original Manuscript_AJESS_117694**
Title of the Manuscript:	**HOW SOCIAL MEDIA CONTRIBUTE TO PATRONAGE OF HOTELS IN CAPE COAST**
Type of the Article	

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. **Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. **Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** 4. **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** 5. **Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** 6. **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. Importance for the Scientific Community: The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses the evolving landscape of social media marketing, particularly in the hospitality industry. It provides valuable insights into how social media influences consumer behavior and hotel patronage, which is relevant for both academic researchers and industry practitioners. The study's findings contribute to the understanding of the impact of digital marketing strategies on customer engagement and business performance in the hotel sector. 2. Title Suitability: The current title, "Challenges of Social Media Marketing," is somewhat broad and does not fully capture the specific focus of the study on the hospitality industry and hotel patronage. A more suitable title could be: • "Impact of Social Media Marketing on Hotel Patronage: Challenges and Prospects in the Hospitality Industry" 3. Abstract Comprehensiveness: The abstract is comprehensive, summarizing the key points of the study, including the objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions. However, it could benefit from a more explicit mention of the main findings and recommendations to provide a clearer snapshot of the study's contributions. 4. Subsections and Structure Appropriateness: The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The paper is well-organized into sections that include an introduction, literature review, methodology, results and discussion, conclusion, and recommendations. This structure allows for a logical flow of information and makes the study easy to follow. 5. Scientific Correctness: The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. It employs both quantitative and qualitative research methods to gather and analyze data, providing a balanced approach to investigating the research questions. The use of SPSS for data analysis adds to the reliability of the findings. The discussion aligns with the results, and the conclusions are supported by the data presented. 6. References Sufficiency and Recency: The references are generally sufficient and include recent studies, ensuring that the manuscript is grounded in current research. However, the study could benefit from incorporating more recent sources from the past 3-4 years to enhance its relevance. Here are a few additional suggestions: • Appel, G., Grewal, L., Hadi, R., & Stephen, A. T. (2020). "The future of social media in marketing." Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 48(1), 79-95. • Balaji, M. S., Roy, S. K., & Quazi, A. (2016). "Customer e-loyalty towards online shopping." Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 31, 163-173. • Majeed, S., Lu, C., & Usman, M. (2022). "Social media marketing, consumer engagement and business performance: A review of the literature." Journal of Business Research, 139, 409-429. These references could provide additional context and support for the findings presented in the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication but requires some refinement to meet the highest standards of academic writing. Addressing the noted issues will enhance clarity, readability, and the overall impact of the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ramesh Kumar Moona Haji Mohamed**
Department, University & Country	**UTAR, Malaysia**