

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_126450
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing Hotel Marketing: An Analysis of Instagram Algorithms
Type of the Article	Review Article

**Review Form 3**  
**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community because it deals with the area of intersection between hotel marketing and social media algorithms, relevant to the hospitality sector's reliance on digital forces today. It is a guide through Instagram's algorithm with information on shadow banning effects that can be informative to hotels in ways of optimizing their content toward increased engagement and visibility. I appreciate the manuscript for raising appropriate challenges, including content strategy and user-generated content, which are not sufficiently addressed in hospitality research. Future study may addempirical data or quantitative analysis to support the recommendations of the proposed strategies.	- no correction needed/ mention
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	- To align the research findings with the focus of the study, the title will be refined to: "Optimizing Hotel Marketing: An Analysis of Instagram Algorithms in 2024." as the content will mostly be based on recent published sources.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in thissection? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is very informative, but the structure could be more organized and specific to be more effective. Improvement suggestions are as follows:  The researcher should define the research methods while mentioning "qualitative methods." But if interviews, case studies, or the social media metrics are incorporated, it would have helped to explain the information. A very brief summary of the key findings-what the researcher might highlight that which kinds of contents have the tendency to provoke most engagement-would help in making an abstract impactful. The researcher should indicate how this study contributes to advance the existing knowledge in hotel marketing research, The phrases "this research shows" are repeated.	- Thank you for your suggestion, the author understands your concern. The abstract has been refined to better elaborate the content of the research and highlight its purpose along with key findings.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The literature review is well-grounded, but a bit more systematic would be appropriate. Add section numbers for consistency, for example, 2.3. Shadowbanning should be 2.4 Shadowbanning.  The methodology section is quite clear. Minor improvements: Specify the sources of the information more precisely, for example, "National and International research articles published between the years 2018 – 2023 in refereed journals". For instance, "Thematic analysis was used to identify key trends and patterns across the collected data.". Mention how many final articles were analyzed from the initial pool of 52 journals for inclusion in the content analysis.  For the Discussion Section, it will be appropriate to compare your findings with previous research for thepurposes of arguing. You may also refer to any surprise insights that you have gathered or inconsistencies with prior studies.  A Conclusion section must exist to clearly summarize findings and make it actionable in hotel marketing.	- Thank you for the feedback, the author has corrected any misspelling, typos, and inconsistency. The author has also refined and specified the methodology to provide greater detail and clarity. Conclusion has been updated to highlight finding.  - Due to some other suggestions, the author has added more subsections to strengthen the connection between hotel marketing and content marketing on Instagram.  - Lastly, following the feedback, the author has added some explanation on the previous results section, as it serves as a crucial link between the research objective and the accumulated results. The author hopes this will better explain the relevance of the content.
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think thatthis manuscript is scientifically robust and technicallysound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript has several reasons that make it scientifically robust and technically sound. First, it assimilates a wide variety of literature from current, credible sources that include reports from the industry and studies on the Instagram algorithm, user behavior, and marketing strategies. It is also well-structured in the analysis because it focuses on relevant variables, such as user-generated content, shadow banning, and engagement metrics, that align with established digital marketing practices. The manuscript, therefore contextualizes the findings with real-world examples, such as Marriott adapting to algorithm changes in order to ensure that the discussion is both practical and theoretically grounded. Thisamalgamation of theory, data, and industry practices helps to support the validity of the research findings.	- no correction needed/ mention

**Review Form 3**

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes the references sufficient and recent	- no correction needed/ mention
--	--	---------------------------------

Review Form 3

<div>Minor REVISION comments</div> <div>Is the language/English quality of the article suitablefor scholarly communications?</div>	<div>Yes, Regarding the clarity researcher should use technical terminology relevant to the field, but avoid jargon that might confuse readers.</div>	<div>- Thank you for the feedback, the author hopes the revision has covered the basics of the reviewers feedback.</div>
<div>Optional/General comments</div>	<div>The topic is current and relevant and has real practical implications for the practice, well-formed question(s), the research is in-line with the trends in the discipline and a good theoretical framework accompanied by a literature review The language was mostly clear, but sometimes minor grammatical errors might be corrected with a final proofing session.</div>	<div>- The author likes to express my appreciation for the feedback. Since English is not their first language, the author finds this helpful.</div>

PART 2:

	<div>Reviewer’s comment</div>	<div>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)</div>
<div>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</div>	<div><u>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></div>	