

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_122837
Title of the Manuscript:	THE INFLUENCE OF WEB PLATFORM AND CUSTOMER BASED FACTORS ON PERCEIVED POSITIVE E-WOM CREDIBILITY AND PURCHASE INTENTIONS
Type of the Article	

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript addresses a critical intersection of digital marketing and consumer behaviour, exploring how web platform characteristics and customer demographics influence perceived e-WOM (electronic word-of-mouth) credibility and purchase intentions. Its findings could provide valuable insights for businesses seeking to enhance their online strategies and foster trust among consumers.</p> <p>I appreciate this manuscript for its relevance in today's digital landscape, where online reviews significantly impact consumer decision-making. By examining both platform and customer factors, it offers a nuanced understanding that could inform future research and practical applications in marketing. However, a potential limitation might be the need for more diverse case studies to ensure generalizability across different industries.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "The Influence of Web Platform and Customer-Based Factors on Perceived Positive E-WOM Credibility and Purchase Intentions" is quite suitable. It clearly indicates the main focus areas: the web platform, customer factors, e-WOM credibility, and purchase intentions. This specificity helps readers quickly understand the scope of the research.</p> <p>However, it could be streamlined for clarity. For example, simplifying "Customer-Based Factors" to "Customer Factors" might enhance readability. Overall, it effectively conveys the article's intent and relevance to the field.</p>	
<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>The abstract you provided is quite comprehensive and covers the essential components effectively.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement You mentioned "Aim: This study explores how perceived positive eWOM review", I suggest the word explore is best fit when the study is qualitative, while your study is quantitative. It can be "This study investigated/ explained "</p> <p>Model Fit Statement: The mention of poor overall model fit could be expanded slightly to clarify its implications for the findings.</p> <p>Future Research: Adding a brief note on potential future research directions could enhance the abstract's relevance for the academic audience.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The author stated that the introduction resembles a literature review, neglecting the importance of providing a clear introduction and background for the study. I suggest starting the introduction with a focus on the dependent variable, highlighting the extent of research conducted in both developed and developing countries. It would be beneficial to discuss the ongoing research efforts in these regions, as well as the factors that have been identified so far.</p> <p>Additionally, the introduction should address what further factors require investigation, as these can serve as the problem statement and highlight existing gaps. The author has not sufficiently identified significant gaps in the study, such as theoretical gaps, knowledge gaps, and literature gaps. Addressing these issues would enhance the introduction's effectiveness and relevance.</p> <p>More importantly, the author has not mentioned or used an underpinning theory to support the model. It is essential to utilize a theoretical framework, especially since the author has employed AMOS for analysis. A relevant theory should be applied and tested to provide a solid foundation for the research.</p>	

Review Form 3

<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>Regarding scientific correctness, this manuscript demonstrates robustness through its use of established methodologies, such as Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and Structural Equation Modelling (SEM). These techniques are well-suited for testing the proposed hypotheses and validating constructs, lending credibility to the findings. Additionally, the integration of website reputation and source credibility into the analysis reflects a comprehensive approach to understanding e-WOM dynamics. The attention to both practical implications and theoretical contributions further reinforces the manuscript's technical soundness, making it a valuable addition to the field of digital marketing research.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Need to use APA</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Good enough</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I strongly recommend the use of an appropriate theory that suits the current model, such as TAM1 or TAM2. Additionally, the manuscript is missing clear research questions and a research model, as well as a detailed explanation of the study's variables. It is important to clarify the types of variables involved and their relationships within the model. Furthermore, while the AMOS model indicates a mediating role, this aspect has not been addressed in the hypotheses testing section.</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>Azhar Khan</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Institute of Social Policy and Research, Pakistan</p>