

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_129087
Title of the Manuscript:	Brand Strategy and the Effective Marketing Position of the Blind Box Industry: A Case Study of Pop Mart
Type of the 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study aims to analyze emerging marketing phenomena of the Blind Box industry through a specific brand, Pop Mart, to develop a case study for Brand Management. Such a study can benefit academicians, marketers, and brand managers by promoting innovative products and brands, especially through social media engagement among Gen Z, immersed in the metaverse and virtual reality.	
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.	The qualitative research design needs to be explained regarding variables and the analysis tools.	
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.	The paper is a superficial review of papers and lacks the rigor of research analysis. The paper needs to have proper research questions/objectives, detailed methodology and analysis (not mere findings).	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Ok	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is very weak – needs professional writing software for proper sentence construction, punctuation and spellings.	
Optional/General comments	The research idea is exciting but lacks an in-depth analysis or justification. It can be treated as the initial draft that requires rigorous upgradation.	

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:	Maithili Ganjoo
Department, University & Country	India