

Review of: "The Advertising and the Other Marketing Communications of Luxury Goods – Archetypal, Semiotic and Narrative Aspects"

Neha Dhruv Agarwal¹

¹ Symbiosis International University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The author seems to be knowledgeable and passionate about the topic at hand. Though the main idea behind the article captures the reader's interest, the scientific rigor of a research backed presentation of ideas is missing.

Abstract: The abstract needs to be more complete. While the purpose and methodologies have been mentioned in the abstract, the originality, scope, need for research and findings from the study need to be included. The abstract can be made more detailed and comprehensive.

Literature Review: The literature review lacks a proper flow. It begins with a loose introduction to luxury goods taking the example of champagne. Paragraph 2 and 3 in literature review attempts to trace the changes in luxury goods marketing over a period of time, the emphasis on how it all began is missing. For instance the literature on the seminal works on the topic of luxury goods is also missing.

The discussion abruptly moves to shopping malls, traditional and digital marketing communications and then goes on to discuss it from the perspective of different countries or and cultures. While these are all relevant points to be made, there should be some flow of thought from one paragraph to the other.

In the paragraph beginning with "Mircea Eliade is a world's famous scientist...." The concept of "centre" has been mentioned but its exact meaning is missing here. We cannot assume that the reader knows what this is. Though a more detailed definition has been provided in the main body of the text, the understanding of this paragraph is lost. Consider rearranging the thoughts to make more sense to the reader.

Methodology: There should be a more detailed section on methodology of research after the literature review and before the main text. It is assumed that the reader understands what a study of psychology, narratives and semantics (or semiotics - both words have been used by the author interchangeably) entails. No other studies which use similar research methods have been sighted to justify the use of such means.

Main Text: The main text is missing sources of information. For example, The Main Archetypal Oppositions lists the archetypes but what is the source of this? Without proper citations are these simply the thoughts of the author? A jotting down of one's thoughts does not constitute as scientific research writing. This can be rectified by including the sources. Does the discussion in the main text follow any particular model on the basis of which the discussion is flowing? An

application of a model will make the research appear more systematic and scientific.

Theoretical Contributions: Are there any theoretical contributions/implications of this study?

Review of Grammar: It is recommended that the author gets a thorough review of the grammar done. There are corrections required such as usage of articles, singular or plural, sentence formation and sentence simplification. This will improve the overall readability of the paper to everyone.