

Peer Review

Review of: "A Birds Eye View into MCDM Applications within Digital Marketing"

Navid Mohammadi¹

1. University of Tehran, Iran, Islamic Republic of

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. Unfortunately, in its current form, the submission does not meet the standards required for publication. The paper has significant conceptual and structural flaws that must be addressed before it could be considered as a research article. My primary concerns are as follows:

1. Lack of a Clear Contribution and Research Question:

The manuscript reads more like a preliminary note or an extended abstract than a complete scholarly work. A fundamental issue is the complete absence of a defined research question, a clear objective, or a hypothesis. The author states that firms "can adapt MCDM Models" but fails to articulate what specific problem this text aims to solve. There is no identification of a research gap. What new understanding does this piece offer that is not already covered by existing review papers (such as references 2 and 5)?

2. Ambiguous Structure and Missing Methodology:

It is unclear what type of article this is meant to be. Is it a literature review, a conceptual framework, or a case study? There is no "Methods" section. If it is a review, the methodology for selecting and analyzing the literature is not described. The narrative jumps from a broad introduction to MCDM to listing a few specific hybrid methods without a logical connective thread or a critical analysis framework.

3. Substantive and Logical Deficiencies:

Abstract & Introduction: The first sentence of the abstract is a fragment ("However, with the availability..."). The introduction and background are overly generic, stating well-known facts about digital marketing and MCDM without building a compelling rationale for the paper.

Superficial Analysis: The description of technologies (AI, Big Data, etc.) and MCDM methods (AHP-COPRA, SF-AHP-TOPSIS) is purely descriptive. There is no critical discussion comparing their strengths, weaknesses, or suitability for different marketing contexts. The claim that AI is "the most optimal

technology” is presented as an unconditional conclusion without any supporting evidence or comparative analysis from the cited studies. This is a sweeping generalization that undermines the paper’s credibility.

Poor Flow and Redundancy: The text is repetitive, particularly in paragraphs discussing the challenges of technology selection and the benefits of MCDM. The sentence structure is often cumbersome.

4. Inadequate References and Scholarship:

The reference list is exceptionally short (only 5 sources) and lacks key foundational and state-of-the-art literature in both MCDM and digital marketing. Two references are conference papers, and one is from a journal of potentially limited scope. For a paper claiming to assess methods, this does not demonstrate a comprehensive engagement with the field.

Overall Assessment:

The core idea of applying MCDM to digital marketing technology assessment is valid and relevant. However, this manuscript, as submitted, is undeveloped. It presents a collection of related statements rather than a coherent, argued, and scholarly contribution. The author needs to fundamentally reconceptualize the work: define a clear purpose, adopt a rigorous structure (e.g., a systematic literature review), conduct a deeper critical synthesis of existing methods, and significantly expand the literature base.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.