

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-58805**

Title: Effect of Social Media Influencers on Consumers Purchase Behavior in the Digital Era.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision ...✓.....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer's ID: JPR- **098**

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Decision: Accept after Major Revision

Major Comments

- Strengthen the theoretical framework:** The manuscript should provide a clearer theoretical foundation for the proposed relationships between social media influencer characteristics and consumer purchase behavior. The rationale for combining trustworthiness, credibility, attractiveness, engagement, content quality, platform, and promotional frequency should be better established.
- Improve the hypothesis development:** The hypotheses are not sufficiently visible or theoretically developed in the manuscript. Each hypothesis should clearly specify the expected relationship between the independent and dependent variables and should be supported by relevant previous studies.
- Clarify the research methodology:** The sampling procedure, participant-selection criteria, sample-size justification, questionnaire development, data-collection procedure, and respondent characteristics need to be explained in greater detail. The use of convenience sampling should also be acknowledged as a limitation.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. **Revise the statistical analysis:** The proposed study contains seven influencer-related factors and six purchase-behavior dimensions, but the main correlation and regression analysis is based only on D_V and I_DV. The authors should clarify these composite variables and ensure that the statistical analysis directly tests the proposed research objectives and hypotheses.
5. **Strengthen validity and reliability analysis:** Although the manuscript reports a very high overall Cronbach's alpha of 0.981 for 39 items, reliability for individual constructs is not reported. The authors should provide construct-level reliability and appropriate validity evidence for the measurement instrument.
6. **Moderate the interpretation of findings:** The Pearson correlation of $r = 0.181$ indicates a statistically significant but weak relationship. Therefore, the conclusion that social media influencers significantly influence consumer purchase behavior should be presented cautiously, with greater attention to effect size and practical significance.
7. **Improve alignment between objectives, results, and conclusions:** The study proposes examining multiple dimensions of purchase behavior, but the reported findings do not fully address all the proposed relationships. The authors should ensure that each objective and hypothesis is explicitly tested and that the conclusions are based only on the statistical evidence obtained.

Minor Revisions

1. **Correct grammatical and typographical errors:** The manuscript contains several grammatical problems and awkward expressions that require comprehensive language editing. For example, "Forty (400) participants" should be corrected to accurately report the sample size.
2. **Define all abbreviations:** Abbreviations such as D_V, I_DV, P_I, A_B_D, B_P, I_B_B, R_P_B, and C_L should be clearly defined when first introduced and used consistently throughout the manuscript.
3. **Improve the literature review:** The literature review should move beyond merely summarizing individual studies and provide a more critical comparison of their findings, methodologies, theoretical perspectives, and limitations.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. **Refine the research gap:** The research gap should be stated more precisely. The manuscript currently identifies several broad gaps, but the specific unresolved research problem and the unique contribution of the present study should be made clearer.
5. **Clarify the descriptive statistics:** The authors should explain the construction of the composite scores and the reported minimum and maximum values, particularly because several variables have maximum values such as 4.33 and 4.67 despite the use of a five-point Likert scale.
6. **Remove duplicate references:** Several references appear more than once in the reference list, including studies by Liu and Zheng, Schouten et al., Sokolova and Kefi, Cheung et al., and Lou and Yuan. These duplicate entries should be removed.
7. **Improve presentation and consistency:** The manuscript should be carefully checked for consistency in terminology, headings, table formatting, statistical notation, citation style, and reference formatting according to the journal's author guidelines.