



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-55961**

Title: SOCIAL MEDIA COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES OF PT. MINESKI INDONESIA IN ENHANCING AUDIENCE ENGAGEMENT DURING THE MOBILE LEGENDS PROFESSIONAL LEAGUE INDONESIA SEASON 15

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- Accept after minor revision**.....
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer Name: Dr.P.Manochithra

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Manuscript Title

Social Media Communication Strategies of PT. Mineski Indonesia in Enhancing Audience Engagement during the Mobile Legends Professional League Indonesia Season 15

1. Overall Evaluation

The manuscript presents a qualitative case study examining social media communication strategies employed by PT. Mineski Indonesia during MPL Indonesia Season 15, with specific focus on Instagram and TikTok. The study is theoretically grounded in the Uses and Gratifications framework and contributes to the growing body of literature on esports communication and digital audience engagement.

The topic is **timely, relevant, and appropriate** for journals focusing on **communication studies, digital media, and esports research**. The manuscript is generally well-structured, methodologically sound, and supported by recent literature. However, several **conceptual, methodological, and presentation-related issues** need to be addressed before the manuscript can be considered for publication.

2. Significance and Contribution

Strengths

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Addresses an **under-researched area**: organization-level social media strategies in esports.
- Focuses on **platform differentiation (Instagram vs TikTok)**, which adds analytical depth.
- Applies the **Uses and Gratifications theory** effectively in a contemporary esports context.
- Uses **triangulated qualitative methods** (interviews, observation, content analysis), enhancing credibility.
- Offers **practical implications** for esports organizers and digital communication practitioners.

Contribution to Literature

The study contributes empirically by:

- Demonstrating how gratification-based strategies are operationalized in esports social media practices.
- Highlighting audience engagement as a **relational and process-oriented phenomenon**.
- Extending esports communication research beyond sponsorship and fandom into **strategic communication execution**.

3. Major Comments (Require Substantial Revision)

3.1 Research Gap and Novelty

- While the introduction is well-written and extensively referenced, the **research gap is not sharply articulated**.
- The manuscript should more clearly state:
 - *What exactly is missing in existing esports social media research?*
 - *How does this study go beyond prior work on engagement or Uses and Gratifications?*

Suggestion:

Add a concise paragraph explicitly stating the **theoretical and empirical novelty**, preferably at the end of the introduction.

3.2 Methodological Transparency

- The manuscript lacks **specific details** regarding:
 - Number of interviews conducted
 - Duration of interviews
 - Criteria for selecting “active audience members”
 - Time period of observation (exact dates or weeks)

Suggestion:

Include a table or paragraph summarizing:

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Number of informants
- Interview duration
- Observation period
- Volume of content analyzed (e.g., number of posts/videos)

3.3 Depth of Data Analysis

- The findings are **well-organized but largely descriptive**.
- Direct quotations from interview informants are **absent**, which weakens qualitative rigor.
- Thematic analysis stages are explained methodologically but **not fully demonstrated empirically**.

Suggestion:

- Add **verbatim quotes** from both social media team members and audience informants.
- Explicitly link quotes to themes (e.g., informational gratification, emotional engagement).

3.4 Results vs. Discussion Overlap

- The **Results and Discussion section is merged**, which leads to repetition and limited analytical depth.
- Some sections reiterate literature instead of critically engaging with it.

Suggestion:

- Clearly distinguish:
 - *Results*: What was found
 - *Discussion*: Why it matters, how it aligns or contrasts with previous studies

3.5 Engagement Measurement

- Audience engagement is discussed conceptually (likes, comments, shares), but:
 - No indicative metrics or comparative figures are provided.
 - Claims such as “higher interaction rates” remain **interpretive rather than demonstrative**.

Suggestion:

Even within a qualitative framework, include **descriptive indicators** (e.g., “posts with entertainment content received noticeably more comments than informational posts”).

4. Minor Comments (Editorial & Technical Issues)

4.1 Language and Style

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Minor grammatical inconsistencies and spacing issues are present.
- Some sentences are excessively long and could be simplified.

Suggestion:

Professional language editing is recommended.

4.2 Table Presentation

- Table 1 formatting is inconsistent (merged words, alignment issues).
- Column headings need clearer separation.

4.3 Keywords

- Keywords such as “**esportscommunication**” should be corrected to “**esports communication**”.
- Consider adding “**Uses and Gratifications**” as a keyword.

4.4 References

- Reference list is extensive and current, which is a strength.
- However:
 - Some URLs are repeated.
 - Formatting is inconsistent in places.

Suggestion:

Standardize references strictly according to the journal's citation style.

5. Ethical Considerations

The manuscript adequately addresses ethical concerns, including informed consent and anonymization. This section is satisfactory and aligns with international research ethics standards.