



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_14168
Title of the Manuscript:	Tesettur Fashion in Turkey: The Contribution of Facebook as a Social Media Marketing Tool
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The introductory text is interesting and important to make the reader understand what tesettur is and its importance. Nevertheless, there's no evidence that "women are more attractive than men", on line 22. The phrase adds no value to the text and should be removed. Giving an evidence of increasing importance of tesettur fashion is important. The authors mention that "resulting colors, shapes and designs have increased a lot"(line 131) Line 177 and 234 makes no sense. On Line 247, the metric "number of entry" must be reviewed, since it measures the numbers of posts made by the page's owner independently of its content. And "number of comments" measures the total of comments made by the page's followers and not only by its consumers, which would be really difficult to measure. The Facebook score was defined, but how the authors know its impact on sales? Metrics are determined by Facebook users, but how can it be validated? How can the authors know the results given by the methodology are valid? Explain more the impact of your results.	Line 177 and 234 revised The phrase "women are more attractive than men" supported; so not removed. Information about "tesettur" given in the next chapters; so thought to be enough for the readers. The meaning of "number of entry" and "number of comments" revised It is difficult to reach the sales for each company so it has been determined as a limitation. By the way it is thought to effect positively. Because followers increase day by day.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 81 and 86 are repetitive, both mention the fact that tesettur must hide womens attractiveness. The use of hereby on line 127 is not appropriate. On Line 174 in "The websites such as", there is no need for "The".	Line 86 has been revised "hereby" on line 127 removed "the" on line 174 been removed
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Interesting approach but it's important to validate results. Also, the data was analysed for a really short period of time. Maybe a long period would bring better results and richer conclusions.	The data has been expanded to 6 months. The main thing in this study is a new perspective to social media marketing in terms of using data and also generating a new formula. This formula may guide the future studies and they may support my results to validate it. Correlation analysis has been added to validate results.