

Imron Rosidi <imronrosidi@gmail.com>

Thank you for reviewing for Heliyon

1 message

Heliyon <em@editorialmanager.com> Reply-To: Heliyon <info@heliyon.com> To: Imron Rosidi <imronrosidi@gmail.com> Tue, Feb 15, 2022 at 7:31 AM

Manuscript Number: HELIYON-D-21-11458R1

Social Mediatization of Religion: Islamic Videos on YouTube

Dear Dr. Rosidi,

Thank you for reviewing the above referenced manuscript for Heliyon, an open access journal that is part of the Cell Press family. I greatly appreciate your contribution and time, which not only assisted me in reaching my decision, but also enables the author(s) to disseminate their work at the highest possible quality. Without the dedication of reviewers like you, it would be impossible to manage an efficient peer review process and maintain the high standards necessary for a successful journal.

I hope that you will consider Heliyon as a potential journal for your own submissions in the future.

Kind regards,

Gregorio González-Alcaide, Ph.D. Section Editor Heliyon

More information and support

You will find guidance and support on reviewing, as well as information including details of how Elsevier recognizes reviewers, on Elsevier's Reviewer Hub: https://www.elsevier.com/reviewers

FAQ: How can I reset a forgotten password?

https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a id/28452/supporthub/publishing/

For further assistance, please visit our customer service site: https://service.elsevier.com/app/home/supporthub/publishing/

Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about Editorial Manager via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/7 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: https://www.editorialmanager.com/heliyon/login.asp?a=r). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

Close

HELIYON-D-21-11458

"Social Mediatization of Religion: Islamic Videos on YouTube" Original Submission

Imron Rosidi (Reviewer 1)

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Accept
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	90
Custom Review Question(s):	Response
Methods: Are the methods described in sufficient detail to understand the approach used and are appropriate statistical tests applied?	Yes
Results: Are the results or data that support any conclusions shown directly or otherwise publicly available according to the standards of the field?	Yes
Interpretation: Are the conclusions a reasonable extension of the results?	Yes
Ethics: Does the study's design, data presentation, and citations comply with standard COPE ethical guidelines and has proper approval and consent been acquired as outlined in our Editorial Policies?	
I acknowledge that I will provide requirements for improvement, where possible, for the paper to meet all the above four criteria in my comments to the author, below.	• OK
Please indicate whether the paper contains one of the following:	None of the above
Comments to Editor:	

Comments to Author:

Methods:

Methods are described in sufficient detail to understand the approach used and are appropriate statistical tests applied. However, the author needs to explain why he or she chooses Bangladesh videos rather than Pakistan, for instance.

Results:

In this paper, results or data that support the conclusions are shown directly or otherwise publicly available according to the standards of the field. Furthermore, the conclusions are a reasonable extension of the results. Interpretation:

The author interprets the data well and the conclusion is provided well informing the limitation of the study. The author also provides a further study which can be conducted.

Other comments:

As a result, I recommend this paper to be published in Heliyon with a minor revision. I suggest the author provides the reasons why he or she selects Bangladesh Islamic videos, not Indonesian Islamic videos for instance. These reasons can be described in the Material & Methods section.

Close

Close

HELIYON-D-21-11458R1

"Social Mediatization of Religion: Islamic Videos on YouTube" Revision 1

Imron Rosidi (Reviewer 1)

		Accept
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:		92
Custom Review Question(s):	Response	
Methods: Are the methods described in sufficient detail to understand the approach used and are appropriate statistical tests applied?	Yes	
Results: Are the results or data that support any conclusions shown directly or otherwise publicly available according to the standards of the field?	Yes	
Interpretation: Are the conclusions a reasonable extension of the results?	Yes	
Ethics: Does the study's design, data presentation, and citations comply with standard COPE ethical guidelines and has proper approval and consent been acquired as outlined in our Editorial Policies?	Yes	
I acknowledge that I will provide requirements for improvement, where possible, for the paper to meet all the above four criteria in my comments to the author, below.	• OK	
Please indicate whether the paper contains one of the following:	None of the above	
Comments to Editor:		
Comments to Author: Methods: The revision made based on my suggestion is acceptable	e.	
Methods:	le.	
Methods: The revision made based on my suggestion is acceptabl	e.	

Close

12/14/22, 9:57 AM View Letter

Date: Feb 05, 2022 **To:** *******

From: "Heliyon" info@heliyon.com

Subject: Decision on submission HELIYON-D-21-11458 to Heliyon

Manuscript. Number.: HELIYON-D-21-11458

Title: Social Mediatization of Religion: Islamic Videos on YouTube

Journal: Heliyon

Dear ******* *******.

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Heliyon. We have completed the review of your manuscript and a summary is appended below. The reviewers recommend major revisions are required before publication can be considered. If you are able to address all reviewer comments in full, I invite you to resubmit your manuscript. We ask that you respond to each reviewer comment by either outlining how the criticism was addressed in the revised manuscript or by providing a rebuttal to the criticism.

This should be carried out in a point-by-point fashion as illustrated here: https://www.cell.com/heliyon/guide-for-authors#Revisions.

To allow the editors and reviewers to easily assess your revised manuscript, we also ask that you upload a version of your manuscript highlighting any revisions made. You may wish to use Microsoft Word's Track Changes tool or, for LaTeX files, the latexdiff Perl script (https://ctan.org/pkg/latexdiff). To submit your revised manuscript, please log in as an author at https://www.editorialmanager.com/heliyon/, and navigate to the "Submissions Needing Revision" folder.

Your revision due date is Mar 24, 2022. We understand that the COVID-19 pandemic may well be causing disruption for you and your colleagues. If that is the case for you and it has an impact on your ability to make revisions to address the concerns that came up in the review process, please reach out to us. I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Kind regards,

Gregorio González-Alcaide, Ph.D.

Associate Editor - Social Sciences

Heliyon

Editor and Reviewer comments:

Reviewer 1: Methods:

Methods are described in sufficient detail to understand the approach used and are appropriate statistical tests applied. However, the author needs to explain why he or she chooses Bangladesh videos rather than Pakistan, for instance.

Results

In this paper, results or data that support the conclusions are shown directly or otherwise publicly available according to the standards of the field. Furthermore, the conclusions are a reasonable extension of the results. Interpretation:

The author interprets the data well and the conclusion is provided well informing the limitation of the study. The author also provides a further study which can be conducted.

Other comments:

As a result, I recommend this paper to be published in Heliyon with a minor revision. I suggest the author provides the reasons why he or she selects Bangladesh Islamic videos, not Indonesian Islamic videos for instance. These reasons can be described in the Material & Methods section.

Reviewer 2: Methods:

This article does not have a scientific methodology based on theory or standard models and measurable indicators. The approach used is quantitative, but the type is not yet clear. This is very visible in the abstract section and the methodology section.

Although the methodology section has mentioned the use of statistics with the help of SPSS, exploring the inferential statistical analysis of Pearson coefficients, these are quantitative statistics that are commonly used. The way of presenting

12/14/22, 9:57 AM View Letter

statistical data still needs to be improved with a more detailed explanation. It would also be better to present statistics if you use tables for easier-to-read illustrations (put them in the draft article in the results and discussion section). The assessment of the measurement of the five selected variables, namely (duration, views, comments, likes, and dislikes) on YouTube, it is also not clear what measurement model to use using what theory, which of course has been scientifically tested and why using these models and standards, should be explained in the methodology section.

The method used is not scientific enough and has not been tested theoretically to understand the approach used so that the statistical test is not appropriate.

Results:

The results or data that support the conclusions shown are not in accordance with scientific standards. This is because the method is not clear and does not use standard models or theories that have been tested as an indicator assessment.

Interpretation:

Ultimately the conclusion is not a reasonable extension of the results

Other comments:

That a research using a scientific methodology must be based on a standard theory or model that has been scientifically tested. I haven't seen this paper based on that.

Please strengthen your paper methodology. Use a standard measurement model that supports it. To clarify a standard model or theory to test your research methodology, here is my explanation

In the methodology section, you mentioned that you use Youtube as the main medium in exploring Islamic da'wah online videos in this case waz. To process and analyze you use: https://tools.digitalmethods.net/netviss/youtube (I failed to access it because of an error).

I want to emphasize that if these tools are accessible, have they become a tested standard model? what is the name of the standard model? who invented and developed? Name some research that has used this standard? etc. This is what I mean by the tested standard model.

Then in your research, you analyze 6 variables. What is the scientific basis for using these 6 variables? state scientific basis? is there a standard model that has been tested using these 6 variables? state what is the model name? who developed and so on?

This needs further explanation in your paper so that it is more scientific, especially in methodology.

Thank You

Data in Brief (optional):

We invite you to convert your supplementary data (or a part of it) into an additional journal publication in Data in Brief, a multi-disciplinary open access journal. Data in Brief articles are a fantastic way to describe supplementary data and associated metadata, or full raw datasets deposited in an external repository, which are otherwise unnoticed. A Data in Brief article (which will be reviewed, formatted, indexed, and given a DOI) will make your data easier to find, reproduce, and cite.

You can submit to Data in Brief when you upload your revised manuscript. To do so, complete the template and follow the co-submission instructions found here: www.elsevier.com/dib-template. If your manuscript is accepted, your Data in Brief submission will automatically be transferred to Data in Brief for editorial review and publication.

Please note: an open access Article Publication Charge (APC) is payable by the author or research funder to cover the costs associated with publication in Data in Brief and ensure your data article is immediately and permanently free to access by all. For the current APC see: www.elsevier.com/journals/data-in-brief/2352-3409/open-access-journal

Please contact the Data in Brief editorial office at dib-me@elsevier.com or visit the Data in Brief homepage (www.journals.elsevier.com/data-in-brief/) if you have questions or need further information.

More information and support FAQ:

How do I revise my submission in Editorial Manager?

https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/28463/supporthub/publishing/

You will find information relevant for you as an author on Elsevier's Author Hub: https://www.elsevier.com/authors

FAQ: How can I reset a forgotten password?

https://service.elsevier.com/app/answers/detail/a id/28452/supporthub/publishing/

For further assistance, please visit our customer service site:

https://service.elsevier.com/app/home/supporthub/publishing/

Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about Editorial Manager via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/7 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email

12/14/22, 9:57 AM View Letter