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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 study focuses on Millennials and Generation Z, yet the abstract lacks a clear justification for this choice. While these demographics are indeed relevant in the context of digital marketing, providing a rationale for focusing exclusively on these groups would strengthen the paper's argument. Thus I recommend the authors add a brief explanation of why these age groups were selected for this research. For example, they could discuss the significance of Millennials and Generation Z as key drivers of online purchasing behavior and their unique interactions with digital advertising. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title is fine. But to make it more attractive and suitable to the research paper.**  **The Reviewer suggests including words something like “The Role of Brand Awareness and Trust in ……”** |  |
| 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. | 1. A good abstract should communicate the entire study and how it has been done. But here, the study doesn’t mention what sampling method was adopted, the Area of the study, or the type of statistical analysis used. 2. It would be more interesting if a brief mention of potential future research directions based on your findings could enhance the abstract. This shows the ongoing relevance of the research area. 3. The study focuses on Millennials and Generation Z, yet the abstract lacks a clear justification for this choice. While these demographics are indeed relevant in the context of digital marketing, providing a rationale for focusing exclusively on these groups would strengthen the paper's argument. Thus I recommend the authors add a brief explanation of why these age groups were selected for this research. For example, they could discuss the significance of Millennials and Generation Z as key drivers of online purchasing behavior and their unique interactions with digital advertising. 4. Some grammar mistakes are spotted. Please correct it. |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | **Yes the structure of the manuscript is appropriate.** |  |
| **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.** | 1. The reviewer observed that the author has not adopted any scientific method to justify the sample size used in the study. 2. The study didn’t use any content and face validity test in the research. 3. In the table-1 the number of laptop users, smartphone users, tablet etc are asked. Here the total of users is 1667 which is the sample size. But here obviously the respondents could have an exception that they could answer more than one option. Here such kind of privilege is missing for respondents. This will result in producing an unfavorable result. Also other options are vague. It's not mentioned what all could be it. 4. In Table 2 under brand awareness the Likert scale statements BA1 are repeated twice. It’s a clerical mistake. The author is requested to correct it. 5. Mean and Standard Deviation: The reported means and standard deviations suggest generally positive attitudes toward Google Shopping Ads. However, discussing the implications of these statistics could enhance understanding. For example, what does a mean of 3.60 indicate in practical terms? 6. The linear regression results support the hypotheses, but discussing the practical significance (effect size) alongside statistical significance would strengthen the findings. For example, what does an R² of 27.85% imply about the overall model's explanatory power? 7. Generalised Linear Model (GLM): Significance of Findings: The GLM results indicate significant differences among demographic factors and their influence on purchase intent. However, consider elaborating on what these differences mean for marketers. For instance, how should they tailor their strategies based on these findings? 8. Wald’s X² Test: Clarify the interpretation of Wald's X² results, especially for readers unfamiliar with this statistical test. 9. Ensure that all tables are clearly labeled and referenced in the text. For instance, mentioning Table 4 results directly in the analysis helps link the findings with the data. 10. Figure 1 should be well-labeled and provide a visual representation of the hypotheses and relationships examined. Discussing its findings in the text could enhance understanding. 11. While there is mention of significant findings, the implications for marketers could be more pronounced. Discuss how the results might inform marketing strategies or decisions related to Google Shopping Ads. 12. Suggest areas for future research based on the findings. For instance, exploring other demographic groups or longitudinal studies to assess changes over time could be valuable. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | Yes, the number of references is adequate. |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Some grammar mistakes are spotted. Please correct it. |  |
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