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| 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 is important for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the use of social media marketing (SMM) among health-related non-profit organizations (NPOs) through the lens of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). By exploring both the positive and negative influences on SMM adoption, the study fills a critical gap in the literature regarding digital marketing strategies for NPOs in the healthcare sector. I appreciate the qualitative approach taken in this research, as it captures the nuanced experiences and perspectives of participants, which are often overlooked in quantitative studies. However, while the findings are robust, I believe the manuscript could benefit from further exploration of potential interventions to address the identified barriers to effective SMM use among these organizations, which would enhance its practical implications. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title of the article is generally suitable as it reflects the focus on the use of social media marketing (SMM) among health-related non-profit organizations (HB NPOs) and the underlying theoretical framework of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). However, it could be made more engaging and informative to better capture the essence of the study.  **Suggested Alternative Title:** "Leveraging Social Media Marketing in Health-Related Non-Profit Organizations: Insights from the Technology Acceptance Model"  This alternative title emphasizes the practical application of SMM and highlights the insights gained from the TAM, which may attract a broader readership interested in both theoretical and practical aspects of SMM in the NPO sector. |  |
| 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 of the article is comprehensive, effectively summarizing the key components of the study, including the objectives, methodology, findings, and implications for health-based non-profit organizations (HB NPOs) regarding social media marketing (SMM). However, I suggest the following enhancements to improve clarity and depth:   1. **Objectives:** Explicitly state the two research objectives at the beginning to provide clear context for the reader. For instance, mention that the study seeks to identify both the positive and negative influences of SMM based on the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). 2. **Methodology:** Briefly specify the qualitative nature of the research and the participant demographics, as this will help readers understand the context of the findings. 3. **Key Findings:** Highlight the most significant positive and negative influences on SMM usage, providing a clearer snapshot of the results. This could include mentioning specific external variables and their impacts. 4. **Recommendations:** Include a brief statement about the recommendations for HB NPOs, emphasizing the importance of strategic SMM utilization for enhancing organizational sustainability.   By incorporating these points, the abstract would provide a more holistic view of the study's contributions and findings, making it more engaging for potential readers. |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate and contribute to the clarity and organization of the content. The manuscript effectively follows a logical flow, starting from the introduction and moving through the results and discussion to the conclusions and recommendations. This structure allows readers to easily follow the progression of the research.  However, I have a few suggestions for improvement:   1. **Subsection Titles:** While the current subsection titles (e.g., "External variables," "Perceived usefulness," "Perceived ease of use," etc.) are descriptive, they could be more concise. Consider using titles like "External Influences," "Usefulness," and "Ease of Use" to enhance readability. 2. **Integration of Findings:** In the results section, the authors could more clearly integrate findings with the relevant literature or theoretical frameworks, such as the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). This could be achieved by linking specific results to the corresponding theoretical constructs more explicitly. 3. **Conclusion Section:** The conclusion could benefit from a more distinct separation from the results and discussion. By clearly delineating the conclusions, the authors can emphasize the significance of their findings and provide a concise summary of the main implications for practice and future research.   Overall, the manuscript is well-structured, but these adjustments could enhance clarity and strengthen the presentation of the research 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.** | The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its well-defined methodology and thorough analysis of the research topic. The use of qualitative interviews provides rich, contextually relevant insights into the experiences of healthcare-related nonprofit organizations (NPOs) regarding social media marketing (SMM), which is crucial for understanding the nuances of their strategies. Furthermore, the manuscript effectively employs the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) to frame its findings, establishing a solid theoretical foundation that enhances the validity of the conclusions drawn.  The integration of recent studies in the discussion section also supports the manuscript’s scientific correctness, as it situates the research within the current academic discourse and highlights the relevance of its findings. Overall, the combination of a clear methodological approach, relevant theoretical framing, and the use of corroborating literature lends credibility to the study and underscores its contribution to the field of nonprofit management and digital marketing. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references cited in the manuscript appear to be both sufficient and relatively recent, encompassing a range of studies that support the findings and discussions presented. The inclusion of works from 2022 and 2024 demonstrates that the authors have engaged with the latest research in the field, ensuring that the manuscript is grounded in contemporary scholarship.  However, to further strengthen the literature review, I suggest considering additional references that explore the impact of social media marketing on nonprofit organizations beyond the healthcare sector. This could provide a broader context for the findings and enhance the generalizability of the conclusions. Specifically, works like "Social Media for Social Good: A Comprehensive Guide to Using Social Media for Nonprofits" by Heather Mansfield (2020) and "Nonprofit Marketing: Marketing Management for the Nonprofit Sector" by Philip Kotler and Nancy Lee (2018) may offer valuable insights and perspectives.  Overall, while the current references are appropriate, expanding the breadth of the literature cited could enrich the manuscript's discussion and provide a more comprehensive understanding of the subject matter. |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and English quality of the manuscript are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The authors employ a clear and formal academic tone, which is appropriate for the target audience. The manuscript is well-structured, and the ideas are presented logically, making it easy for readers to follow the arguments and findings.  However, there are occasional instances of awkward phrasing and grammatical errors that could benefit from revision for clarity and fluency. For example, some sentences are lengthy and could be broken down for easier comprehension. Additionally, the use of more precise terminology in certain sections could enhance the manuscript's overall clarity.  Overall, while the manuscript is comprehensible and conveys the intended messages effectively, a thorough proofreading and editing process would improve the language quality and ensure it meets the highest standards of scholarly communication. |  |
| Optional/General comments | Overall, the manuscript provides valuable insights into the use of social media marketing (SMM) among health-related non-profit organizations (HB NPOs). The study effectively identifies both positive and negative influences on SMM usage through the lens of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), contributing to a nuanced understanding of the challenges and opportunities faced by these organizations.  One suggestion for improvement would be to consider incorporating more specific case studies or examples of successful SMM initiatives from HB NPOs, which could enhance the practical applicability of the findings. Additionally, while the qualitative approach offers rich insights, a mixed-methods design that includes quantitative data could further strengthen the robustness of the conclusions drawn.  The limitations section provides a thoughtful reflection on the study’s scope, but it could also suggest specific areas for future research that could build on the findings. Finally, a more in-depth discussion on the implications of these findings for policy makers and stakeholders in the non-profit sector would enrich the manuscript's contribution to the field.  Overall, this manuscript is a commendable addition to the literature on SMM in non-profit organizations and provides a solid foundation for future research.  The manuscript appears to address ethical considerations appropriately, particularly given its focus on health-related non-profit organizations (HB NPOs) and the sensitive nature of the topics discussed. However, there are a few areas where the authors should clarify their ethical considerations:   1. **Informed Consent**: It should be explicitly stated whether informed consent was obtained from the participants involved in the interviews. This is particularly important given the potential vulnerability of the populations served by HB NPOs. 2. **Confidentiality**: The authors should ensure that participant anonymity is maintained, especially since the interviews likely involve personal and organizational insights. Including a statement on how confidentiality was preserved would enhance the ethical rigor of the study. 3. **Impact on Participants**: The potential impacts of the findings on the organizations and individuals involved should be discussed. This includes how the results might influence public perception of HB NPOs and the responsibilities of the organizations to communicate their work accurately.   Addressing these points would strengthen the manuscript’s ethical framework and ensure that it adheres to the standards expected in scholarly research. Overall, while the study does not appear to present significant ethical issues, clear communication of these considerations would be beneficial. |  |
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