



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_52098
Title of the Manuscript:	THE STRATEGY OF SOCIAL MEDIA USAGE AND CONTEMPORARY MODERN INSTALLATION FOR MILLENNIAL GENERATION VISITING DECISION (YAYOI KUSAMA EXHIBITION CASE STUDY IN MACAN MUSEUM JAKARTA)
Type of the Article	Case study

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript needs major edit, perhaps the author(s) can consult an English expert. There are many error of fragments in the sentence structures that makes communication difficult. I have highlighted areas where sentences or words needs to be corrected. 2. The abstract needs to be reworked to capture the background, objective(s), method and findings. 3. The strength of any research work is that it is able to incorporate the ideas of other researchers. This work is deficient in this area and needs an improvement in both the in-and-end text citation. 4. Under "1.2 SWOT Analysis and Service Quality Concepts" Cronin and Taylor (1992,1994) were cited but they do not appear at the end text. 5. The method section appears quite interesting but the author(s) were economical with the procedure. To ensure that the study is as scientific as stated the process leading to data collection must be clearly stated to avoid ambiguity. For instance, it must be clearly stated if the author(s) used observing-participant, participant-observer or neutral observer, each has its own implications. Using observation method also means that when and how data were collected must be specified. Also, the method section should describe the type of social media used in the study as well as justify its use. 6. Result section: the section started with the discussion of the study area. This should have been presented at the method section. 7. Under section 3.2 the author(s) spent a great deal of time describing the activities in the Macan Museum, this is totally unnecessary considering that there are other important objectives yet to be addressed. 8. The work successfully described the activities within Macan Museum but failed to address the most important objective: how is social media used as a marketing strategy to attract millennial visitors to be part of the exhibition. 9. The result/discussion section must include how this result relates or differs with the findings of other researchers. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Background: This section needs a minor improvement especially on the social media context. In-text citation is very important 2. Literature review: provide in-text and end-text citation for Allan. Also, improve this section because it looks more like conceptual definitions than a literature review 3. Explanation of SWOT Matrix and the Grand Strategy Matrix as used in section 1.2 and also clearly explain the aim(s) of using it. 4. Under "method" the sentence in line 125 starting from "researchers will also provide..." sounds more like significance of the study. If so, it should be moved to the background. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add 'and' to the fourth point in line 60 under 1.1.1 Museum 2. Adding the Macan Museum's email to this work is totally unnecessary 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aloysius Odii
Department, University & Country	University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria