

[Review Form3](#)

Book Name:	Science and Technology: Developments and Applications
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3968
Title of the Manuscript:	Social Intelligence and Consumer Feedback Loops in the Innovation Cycle of Electronics
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it offers a comprehensive analysis of how social intelligence and consumer feedback loops influence innovation in the electronics industry. By utilizing a mixed-methods approach, it provides empirical data that connects real-time consumer insights to product development and customer satisfaction. The findings bridge theoretical research and practical application, making it a valuable resource for both scholars and industry practitioners seeking to enhance their innovation processes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes. The title "Social Intelligence and Consumer Feedback Loops in the Innovation Cycle of Electronics" is suitable as it clearly conveys the main themes of the manuscript, including the focus on social intelligence, consumer feedback, and their impact on innovation within the electronics industry.	
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 generally comprehensive, but it could be enhanced by including specific examples of how social media platforms, such as Twitter and Reddit, are utilized to gather consumer insights, which would provide concrete context for the research. Additionally, a brief mention of the mixed-methods approach employed in the study would highlight the robustness of the findings and the diverse data sources used. Including one or two key findings or implications of the research would further summarize the manuscript's contributions effectively. Lastly, a sentence addressing potential future research directions or the implications of integrating AI-driven analytics could offer a forward-looking perspective, making the abstract more informative and engaging for readers.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically sound, employing a mixed-methods approach that combines quantitative and qualitative data, which is appropriate for exploring social intelligence and consumer feedback in the electronics innovation cycle. It references established theories, such as von Hippel's work on user innovation, enhancing its credibility. The focus on real-time consumer insights and social media as data sources is relevant to current industry trends. However, it would be important to ensure that the no of feedbacks collected and that the analysis is conducted using appropriate statistical methods.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Regarding the reference, firstly the given reference aren't sufficient. Except the literature review part there is no reference found in anyother part of the manuscript. The given references is also not from the recent years. References from recent studies (from the last 5 years) that explore the impact of social media on consumer behavior and product development in the electronics industry.	

[Review Form3](#)

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language and English quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, coherent, and well-structured, effectively conveying complex ideas related to social intelligence, consumer feedback, and innovation in the electronics industry.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure and Organization: The article appears to have a logical structure, with a clear introduction, methodology, and findings. Ensuring that each section transitions smoothly into the next will enhance readability. • Engagement with Existing Literature: Engaging more deeply with existing literature that particularly focus on the considered variables can provide a stronger theoretical framework for the study. Discussing how the findings relate to or challenge previous research can enhance the scholarly contribution. • Depth of Analysis: While the excerpts indicate a solid understanding of the topic, it would be beneficial to ensure that the analysis is deep enough to address potential counterarguments or limitations of the study. Discussing these aspects can strengthen the overall argument. • Brands: The author has mentioned only three brands in the study. Reason for considering only these brands is missing in the manuscript. • Statistical tool: The author did not mention which statistical tool or software was used to perform the analysis. • Discussion, Implications and Recommendations: The article should clearly outline the Discussion of the results derived from the analysis, theoretical and practical implications of the findings for industry practitioners. Providing actionable recommendations based on the research could add significant value. • Limitations and Future Research Directions: Including a section on limitation of the study and the future research directions can help contextualize the study within the broader field and encourage further exploration of the topic. • References and Citations: There is a complete lack of references in the introduction, data analysis. <p>Overall, the article seems to be on a solid path, and addressing these points could further enhance its quality and impact in the field of electronics innovation and consumer behavior.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Hepzibah Gnana Sinthiya R</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Voorhees College, India</p>