

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 58336

Title: The Influence of Social Media Platforms on Teenagers' Fashion Choices.

Recommendation:

Accept after minor revision

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity			✓	
Significance	✓			

Reviewer's ID: Abdul Haseeb Mir

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The manuscript titled "The Influence of Social Media Platforms on Teenagers' Fashion Choices" explores a highly relevant and contemporary phenomenon: the mechanisms through which digital spaces dictate, inspire, and shape the aesthetic preferences and consumer actions of modern youth. Employing a quantitative survey design ($N = 44$), the study explores variables such as general social media exposure, the visual impact of fashion content, the role of digital creators, and the crystallization of consumer purchase intentions.

Key Contributions and Positives

- Theoretical Integration:** A major strength of the paper lies in its robust theoretical multi-layering. By synthesizing **Consumer Socialization Theory**, **Social Influence Theory**, **Social Comparison Theory**, and the **Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB)**, the author provides a solid conceptual architecture that accurately contextualizes why and how digital platforms function as fundamental socialization and peer-approval mechanisms.
- Granular Item-Level Diagnostics:** The empirical analysis successfully breaks down the nuances of digital influence. The study establishes that while social media plays an extraordinary role in **brand discovery (84.1% agreement)** and **style experimentation (61.4% agreement)**, it does not necessarily translate into a loss of agency, given that only **31.8%** of respondents express a desire to blindly mimic influencers.
- Methodological Transparency:** The author displays commendable academic honesty by explicitly pointing out the limitations of the data collection instruments, particularly the usage of

REVIEWER'S REPORT

an *Influencer/Peer Influence Proxy* to substitute for a direct measure of "trust" when testing Hypothesis 2.

Recommendations for Improvement**1. Re-Evaluating the Target Population and Demographic Title**

A profound systemic discrepancy exists between the title/abstract of the paper and the generated sample group. While the study claims to examine "teenagers," the descriptive statistics reveal that **52.3% of the respondents are aged 20 or above (ranging up to 27 years old)**.

- **Correction:** The author must explicitly adjust the manuscript's narrative or rephrase the target demographic terms. It should be reframed as a study on "**Youth and Emerging Adults**" (Ages **14–27**), with a dedicated, isolated sub-analysis tracking the distinct behavior of the true teenage cohort (ages 13–19, $n = 21$) against the young adult cohort ($n = 23$). The current claims overgeneralize "teenagers" when the majority of the data points belong to an older demographic.

2. Deepening the Statistical Analysis

The empirical results rely exclusively on basic bivariate metrics (Pearson's r and Spearman's ρ). Given that the author has designed a highly sophisticated theoretical framework using multiple independent vectors (exposure, influencers, viral content) to explain a singular behavioral outcome (purchase intention), simple correlations are insufficient.

- **Correction:** The data analysis section should be expanded to include **Multiple Linear Regression Analysis**. This would allow the author to evaluate the relative predictive weights of *Social Media Exposure* versus *Influencer Peer Proxies* on *Purchase Intention*, and determine which digital touchpoint serves as the primary driver of consumption.

3. Resolving Inconsistencies regarding Peer Influence

The manuscript exhibits a contradiction regarding the role of peers. The abstract states that "*it was not possible to establish the role of peers in this context due to a lack of information,*" and Section 8.4 reiterates that no specific questions regarding peer opinions were included. However, the author constructed a composite scale explicitly named the "*Influencer/Peer Influence Proxy*" and anchored Hypothesis 2 around "*peer recommendations.*"

- **Correction:** To maintain academic validity, the phrase "peer recommendations" must be systematically removed from the statement of H2, the construct names, and the conclusion. The scale items (q3, q7, q11) measure *influencers, celebrities, and generalized online figures*, not personal peer-group networks.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Editorial Recommendation

This manuscript addresses a vibrant, fast-evolving intersection of retail marketing, youth psychology, and digital sociology. Despite the sample size limitations, the insights generated regarding intentional trend modification versus impulsive buying are valuable.

Therefore, I recommend this article for publication with **Minor Revision**, contingent upon the structural resolution of the demographic age profile labeling and the removal of the unsupported peer-influence assertions.