

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-51778

Date: 22/05/2025

Title: Analysis of the Existing E-mailing Management Tools and Systems: Methodology for the study of the existing situation.

Recommendation:

Accept after minor revision.

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity			✓	
Significance			✓	

Reviewer Name: Dr. Bishwajit Rout

Date: 22/05/2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.

- Significance:** This research offers a comprehensive comparative analysis of top email marketing tools, such as Mailchimp, HubSpot, and Klaviyo within the e-commerce ecosystem. By establishing standardized evaluation criteria, it supports more informed decision-making for businesses seeking email solutions that align with marketing goals, automation needs, and user expectations, thereby enhancing strategic customer engagement and digital communication effectiveness.
- Strength:** The study's strength lies in its systematic and transparent methodology. It defines clear evaluation dimensions like automation, segmentation, integration, pricing, usability, and compliance while synthesizing data from credible sources, including user platforms and official documentation. This rigor enables reliable, reproducible comparisons, offering valuable strategic insights for developers and e-commerce stakeholders optimizing digital outreach tools.
- Key Insight:** A key insight is that no email marketing platform excels universally; each tool demonstrates distinct strengths based on specific business needs. For example, Klaviyo excels in e-commerce targeting, while HubSpot offers strong CRM integration. The study emphasizes that optimal platform selection depends on aligning tool capabilities with business scale, user proficiency, and marketing objectives.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Reviewer's Comment / Report

The paper titled “*Analysis of the Existing E-mailing Management Tools and Systems: Methodology for the study of the existing situation.*” presents a structured, well-documented comparative analysis of leading email marketing tools used in e-commerce. The study evaluates key platforms (e.g., Mailchimp, Brevo, GetResponse, Klaviyo) across a defined set of criteria including automation, personalization, segmentation, integrations, usability, and pricing. It offers a practical, research-informed framework and provides a clear comparative table synthesizing major features. While highly relevant and methodologically sound, the paper would benefit from improved narrative flow, clearer figure labeling, and slightly more critical discussion in the conclusion.

Suggestions for Improvement:

1. Clearly define the novelty of this research. what sets this evaluation apart from existing comparison reports?
2. Consider providing a summarized table of all criteria categories for quick reference.
3. Add a sentence or two justifying the inclusion of each major category from a user or business need perspective.
4. Improve visual consistency and labeling of the comparative table.
5. Mention limitations of relying on secondary data (e.g., vendor websites, user reviews).
6. Expand slightly on the selection rationale (e.g., market share, target audience).
7. Highlight specific tools as best-fit for use cases (e.g., small businesses, B2C e-commerce, marketing agencies).
8. Expand discussion of practical implications for users (e.g., how should a business choose based on maturity or scale?).
9. Include any observable gaps in the market that new tools might aim to fill.

The paper offers a well-structured, methodologically sound comparative analysis of leading email marketing tools for e-commerce. It effectively defines evaluation criteria and synthesizes platform strengths. Minor revisions in formatting, citation consistency, and conclusion depth are recommended to enhance clarity and impact. Addressing the identified weaknesses will make it suitable for publication in IJAR.

I recommend this paper for publication after minor revision.