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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.** | The significance of the manuscript lies in its focus on a qualitative analysis of the technology acceptance model (TAM) in sports marketing. Its focus on non-professional organizations (Western Province Super League) rugby clubs adds nuance to the study. The TAM model is well integrated into sports social media marketing (SMM), and the study identifies key drivers for SMM use, providing insights into significant behavior intentions. Using Altas.ti for developing themes and codes enhances the study’s robustness for the scientific community.  |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title is evident as it conveys the main focus of the study, but there is a slight improvement. Instead of ‘Usage by’ a more direct verb should be used. To make it more specific and nuanced, ‘non professional’ should be added, e.g.“Social media marketing in non-professional rugby clubs: A qualitative perspective using technology acceptance model”  |  |
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