

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_123084
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of The Influence of E-Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction, Customer Trust, and Repurchase Intention on Word of Mouth
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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.	I appreciate this manuscript for its methodological rigor and its potential to bridge the gap between academic theory and practical application in the fast-moving field of social commerce. The use of structural equation modelling provides robust statistical support for the findings, enhancing their credibility and applicability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	This alternative title here's a suggestion that could potentially make it more specific and engaging: "Driving Word of Mouth in E-Commerce: The Impact of Service Quality, Customer Experience, and Repurchase Intention on TikTok Shop" This alternative title: Emphasizes the e-commerce context more explicitly. Uses more action-oriented language ("Driving Word of Mouth"). Groups customer satisfaction and trust under the broader term "Customer Experience". Specifies the platform being studied (TikTokShop)	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>Here are my suggestions for additions and improvements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Background: Add a brief sentence about the context of the study, mentioning the growing importance of e-commerce and social commerce platforms like TikTokShop. Methodology: Provide more specific information about the sample size (220 respondents) and the sampling technique used (non-probability, convenience sampling). Results: Include some key statistical findings, such as the strength of relationships between variables or the most significant predictors of word of mouth. Implications: Add a sentence about the practical implications of the findings for e-commerce businesses or marketers. Limitations: Briefly mention a key limitation of the study, such as the focus on a single platform (TikTokShop). <p>Here's a suggested revised structure for the abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Background: With the rapid growth of e-commerce and social commerce platforms, understanding customer behavior is crucial for business success. Aim: This study examines the impact of e-service quality, customer satisfaction, customer trust, and repurchase intention on word of mouth among TikTokShop customers. Methodology: A quantitative approach was employed, with data collected through online questionnaires distributed to 220 respondents via Google Forms, using non-probability convenience sampling. Data were analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with the PLS program. Results: The findings reveal that e-service quality positively and significantly influences customer trust, customer satisfaction, repurchase intention, and word of mouth. Customer trust and satisfaction significantly enhance repurchase intention and word of mouth. E-service quality showed the strongest effect on customer satisfaction ($\beta = 0.724, p < .001$). Implications: These results highlight the importance of e-service quality in driving customer satisfaction and positive word of mouth in social commerce platforms. Limitations: The study focuses solely on TikTokShop, which may limit generalizability to other e-commerce platforms. <p>Keywords: e-service quality, customer satisfaction, customer trust, repurchase intention, word of mouth, e-commerce TikTokShop." This revised abstract provides a more comprehensive and structured overview of the study, including key elements expected in a scientific abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>It provides empirical evidence on the interrelationships between key factors in e-commerce success, specifically in the context of a rapidly growing platform (TikTokShop). This contributes to the evolving understanding of consumer behavior in digital marketplaces. The study's focus on TikTokShop is particularly timely and relevant, given the platform's increasing prominence in social commerce. It offers insights into how traditional e-commerce concepts apply to newer, more interactive shopping environments.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article is generally understandable, but it falls short of the standards typically expected for scholarly communications. There are several areas that need improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grammar and Syntax: There are numerous grammatical errors and awkward sentence structures throughout the text. For example, in the abstract: "A quantitative approach was employed, with data collected through online questionnaires distributed to 220 respondents via Google Forms." This sentence is passive and could be more concise. Clarity and Conciseness: Some sentences are overly long and complex, which can obscure the meaning. The writing could benefit from more precise and concise language. 2. Consistency: There are inconsistencies in terminology and formatting, such as varying capitalization of "Word of Mouth" vs "word of mouth". 3. Academic Tone: While the overall tone is academic, there are instances where the language is too casual for scholarly writing. 4. Technical Language: Some technical terms are not consistently used or clearly defined, which could confuse readers unfamiliar with the field. 5. Punctuation: There are issues with punctuation, particularly with commas and semicolons. 6. Paragraph Structure: Some paragraphs are very long and could be broken up for better readability and flow of ideas. 7. Transitions: The transitions between sections and ideas could be smoother to enhance the overall coherence of the article. <p>To improve the language quality for scholarly communication, the article would benefit from: Thorough proofreading and editing by a native English speaker or professional editor familiar with academic writing standards. Also simplifying complex sentences and ensuring each paragraph focuses on a single main idea. Moreover, standardizing terminology and formatting throughout the document. And also enhancing the precision of language, especially when describing methodological procedures and results. Improving the overall structure and flow of the article to ensure a logical progression of ideas.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Muthana Faaeq Almasooudi</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Sains Malaysia, Iraq</p>