

Sincerely,  
Zheng Yan  
Editor-in-Chief  
Human Behavior & Emerging Technologies

## — Reviewer Reports

1 submitted

### Report

Reviewer 1 07.04.2022

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this paper. I have read the paper with great interest. The overall idea of the paper seems interesting. The research paper identifies the determinants that affect consumers' behavior on YouTube product reviews in Indonesia. The novel contribution of this research is the introduction of stimuli of sensory marketing, argument quality, and source credibility on individual organisms such as parasocial interactions, information usefulness, and trust, which are correlated with consumers' responses to stickiness, information adoption, and purchase intentions.

The authors have used Indonesia as a base country and started with the youtube usage ratios in Indonesia. In the following sentences, "Numerous studies have attempted to investigate the importance of product reviews on YouTube in the marketing and consumer behavior fields. However, besides the limited studies focused on YouTube product reviews as social commerce channels, there is also a lack of studies explaining the phenomenon in Indonesia. Meanwhile, the social commerce market in Southeast Asian countries, including Indonesia." However I would suggest justifying why such research is important in Indonesia. There are a good number of research papers available on the subject. A similar idea has been pitched by various authors (few of them have been cited). A strong justification for carrying out a similar study again in Indonesia is required.

There is a repetition of the ideas in various paragraphs for example the sentences mentioned by me earlier from the second paragraph of the manuscript and the following sentences from the third paragraph share the same thought " Due to the inadequacy of existing studies investigating YouTube product reviews and their prominent role in social commerce, particularly in Indonesia, theoretical models are required to investigate this phenomenon." The authors focus on the importance of youtube reviews I suggest following a more robust approach by justifying the need for using a predecided list of variables. What is the importance of those variables and how and why they have been used in the current study? The last paragraph of the introduction can be removed in order to manage the word limit.

The variables have been explained to a great extent in the literature review, and then in hypotheses development, the relationships have been briefly explained. I believe these are commonly placed terminologies and may not require separate detailed explanations. I suggest starting the justification of hypotheses by briefly explaining the constructs and spending more time on the relationship