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| PART 1: Review Comments | | |
| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **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.** | **This manuscript holds significant value for the scientific community as it addresses a crucial intersection between healthcare-based non-profits and digital marketing through the lens of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). By exploring how social media marketing (SMM) influences stakeholder engagement, fundraising, and awareness efforts in South Africa, the study sheds light on both the motivators and barriers that impact SMM usage within the non-profit sector. This research is particularly relevant for developing nations, where resource constraints and digital adoption challenges may hinder such initiatives. I appreciate this manuscript for its comprehensive approach, using qualitative analysis and a strong theoretical framework to explore SMM in a unique context that has been underrepresented in existing literature.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **Yes, the title is suitable for the article. It clearly conveys the study's focus on examining social media marketing (SMM) within healthcare-based non-profit organizations (HB NPOs) and highlights the specific theoretical framework, the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), used for analysis.** |  |
| 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 abstract is well-structured and mostly comprehensive, but it could be further strengthened by clarifying the study's main findings and providing additional context on the implications. To make the abstract more effective, it could highlight specific positive and negative influences uncovered in the study, giving readers a clearer understanding of its contributions. Summarizing the practical implications of these findings would also be helpful, such as how healthcare-based non-profit organizations (HB NPOs) might use this information to enhance their social media strategies or overcome identified barriers. Additionally, emphasizing the study’s contribution to TAM literature, particularly within the unique context of healthcare-based non-profits in developing nations, would increase its relevance.** |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | **The structure and subsections of your manuscript on social media marketing (SMM) among health-based non-profit organizations (HB NPOs) are well-organized and appropriate for conveying your research. The introduction effectively outlines the purpose and significance of the study, providing necessary background information to contextualize your work within existing literature. Your results and discussion sections are thorough, detailing both positive and negative influences on SMM usage while breaking findings down into clear subsections such as external variables, perceived usefulness (PU), perceived ease of use (PEU), behavioral intentions, and actual use of SMM. These subsections enhance readability and clarity, with participant quotes adding depth to illustrate key points. Additionally, your conclusions and recommendations are actionable and relevant, addressing the identified issues and reflecting on the study's findings.** |  |
| **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.** | **This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, as it employs a well-defined research methodology grounded in the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) to explore the use of social media marketing (SMM) among health-based non-profit organizations (HB NPOs). The qualitative approach, including semi-structured interviews and purposive sampling, allows for an in-depth exploration of participants' experiences and insights, which enhances the richness of the data collected. Furthermore, the study thoroughly analyzes both positive and negative influences on SMM usage, drawing on participant quotations and relevant literature to support its findings. The clear identification of variables influencing SMM, along with actionable recommendations for HB NPOs, demonstrates the manuscript's contribution to the field, ensuring that it is not only theoretically grounded but also practically relevant for stakeholders in the non-profit sector.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | **The references in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and generally recent, providing a solid foundation for the study's arguments and findings. The inclusion of sources from the last few years indicates that the authors are engaging with current research in the field. However, to strengthen the manuscript further, I suggest considering additional references that focus on the specific application of social media marketing within non-profit organizations, especially those that may address recent developments in social media platforms or trends. For example: Lovejoy, K., & Saxton, G. D. (2012). "Information, Community, and Action: How Nonprofit Organizations Use Social Media." Journal of Technology in Human Services, 30(3), 292-302. And Bennett, R., & Savani, S. (2020). "Social Media and Fundraising in the Nonprofit Sector: A Comprehensive Review." Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 30(2), 245-267. Harrison, J., & McMillan, D. (2021). "Measuring the Impact of Social Media on Nonprofit Organizations' Fundraising Success." Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing, 33(1), 67-85. Bortree, D. S., & Seltzer, T. (2009). "Dialogic Strategies and Outcomes: An Analysis of the Corporate Blogosphere." Public Relations Review, 35(4), 375-377.** |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript demonstrates a clear and organized structure, effectively conveying complex ideas related to social media marketing among health-related non-profit organizations. The authors utilize appropriate academic terminology and maintain a formal tone throughout the text. However, there are instances where sentence clarity and flow could be improved, potentially benefiting from thorough proofreading to eliminate minor grammatical errors and enhance coherence. Overall, with some revisions for clarity and precision, the manuscript meets the standards expected in scholarly writing. |  |
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