

THE IMPACT OF ONLINE CUSTOMER REVIEWS ON BRAND REPUTATION

Axrorov Saidmunirxon¹, Chairul Furqon², Heny Hendrayati³, Inomjon Qudratov⁴

^{1,4}Tashkent State University of Economics, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

^{2,3}Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

saidmunirxonaxrorov752@gmail.com¹, c_furqon@upi.edu², henyhendrayati@upi.edu³,
i.qudratov.ifm@tsue.uz⁴

Abstract

This article investigates the influence of online customer reviews on brand reputation within digital marketplaces. The study employs a Systematic Literature Review informed by PRISMA 2020, synthesising peer-reviewed publications from 2015 to 2025, indexed in Scopus, Web of Science, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar. The review shows that review valence, review volume, credibility, authenticity, helpfulness, reviewer expertise, managerial responses, and platform governance have the biggest and most consistent effects on brand reputation. Positive, detailed, and trustworthy reviews boost perceived quality, trust, and legitimacy. On the other hand, negative, suspicious, or inconsistent reviews can quickly hurt a brand's reputation. The results also show that quick and responsible responses from managers can protect a company's reputation, while suspicions of fake reviews and poor platform moderation can hurt both review trust and brand trust. In general, online reviews are no longer just a side note; they are now a key part of a company's reputation that they need to manage carefully.

Keywords: *online customer reviews; electronic word of mouth; brand reputation; brand trust; review credibility*

Abstrak

Artikel ini mengkaji bagaimana ulasan pelanggan online membentuk reputasi merek di pasar digital. Melalui Systematic Literature Review yang mengikuti pedoman PRISMA 2020, penelitian ini mensintesis publikasi ilmiah bereputasi tahun 2015-2025 yang dihimpun dari Scopus, Web of Science, ScienceDirect, dan Google Scholar. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahwa reputasi merek paling konsisten dipengaruhi oleh valensi ulasan, volume ulasan, kredibilitas, autentisitas, helpfulness, keahlian pengulas, respons manajerial, dan tata kelola platform. Ulasan yang positif, rinci, dan terpercaya memperkuat persepsi kualitas, kepercayaan, dan legitimasi, sedangkan ulasan negatif, mencurigakan, atau tidak konsisten dapat merusak reputasi merek dengan cepat. Temuan juga memperlihatkan bahwa respons manajerial yang cepat dan bertanggung jawab dapat mengurangi kerusakan reputasi. Secara keseluruhan, ulasan online merupakan mekanisme reputasional utama yang harus dikelola secara strategis oleh perusahaan.

Kata kunci: ulasan pelanggan online; electronic word of mouth; reputasi merek; kepercayaan merek; kredibilitas ulasan

Correspondensi: saidmunirxonaxrorov752@gmail.com¹

INTRODUCTION

Digitalisation has changed how brands are evaluated in public (Ardissa et al., 2025). In conventional mass communication environments, companies controlled most reputational messages through advertising, public relations, and direct customer contact (Kim, 2022). In platform-based markets, however, brand reputation is formed in a more distributed way because consumers continuously produce ratings, textual reviews, photographs, complaint narratives, and recommendations that remain visible, searchable, and comparable over time. As a result, online customer reviews shape not only purchase decisions but also broader perceptions of reliability, transparency, and trustworthiness (Jamal et al., 2021).

The strategic relevance of online reviews is visible across e-commerce, hospitality, local services, food delivery, beauty products, health platforms, and digital marketplaces. Earlier work showed that electronic word of mouth affects relative sales, bookings, and product visibility, while later studies demonstrated that these effects vary according to product uncertainty, platform design, and customer experience (Hennig-thurau et al., 2004). Yet brand reputation goes beyond immediate intention to buy. It is a cumulative judgment concerning whether a brand is dependable, competent, and ethically credible over time, and it influences willingness to pay, long-term loyalty, forgiveness after service failure, and resistance to switching (Kostritsa et al., 2020).

Online customer reviews are especially influential because they combine quantitative and qualitative signals. Consumers often encounter star ratings, review counts, helpfulness votes, reviewer badges, narrative detail, emotional tone, and visual proof at the same time. This means that average scores alone cannot explain reputational outcomes. A highly rated brand may still look unreliable if the written reviews appear repetitive, manipulated, exaggerated, or inconsistent

with the rating, whereas a moderate amount of balanced criticism may sometimes increase authenticity because the review profile looks more realistic (Filieri, 2015b).

The review environment has also become more complex in recent years. Research now pays greater attention to fake reviews, AI-generated content, score-text inconsistency, platform moderation, and the public visibility of managerial responses (Yusuf; Ramayani; 2020). These developments matter because consumers do not judge a brand only from what reviewers say; they also infer meaning from how platforms verify reviews and how companies react to criticism. In this context, review systems function as public arenas where trust can be built, contested, and repaired in real time (G. Zhu, 2019).

There is a lot of research on online reviews, but it is still spread out across fields like marketing, information systems, tourism, consumer behaviour, and e-commerce (Rakhmanita et al., 2023). A lot of research looks at sales, bookings, or purchase intention instead of reputation itself. Other studies look at things like authenticity, helpfulness, or response strategy, but they don't put these things together into a clear framework for reputation. So, we need a systematic synthesis to make it clear which review features have the biggest impact on brand reputation, how these effects change depending on the situation, and where the current literature still needs more evidence (Ramsaroop & Petersen, 2020).

Based on that gap, this article aims to identify the main review dimensions that influence brand reputation, explain how platform conditions and managerial responses modify these effects, and summarize the central research gaps that remain in the field. The study uses only the literature synthesized in the author's article and reorganizes it into a concise journal-ready structure.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Three theoretical perspectives elucidate the significance of online reviews for brand reputation. First, signaling theory argues that consumers rely on external cues when information is incomplete. In digital marketplaces, reviews act as signals because they communicate the experiences of previous users and reduce uncertainty about product quality, service reliability, and brand credibility (Spence, 1973; Chevalier & Mayzlin, 2006). Positive and detailed reviews may signal quality consistency, whereas suspicious or highly inconsistent reviews may signal unreliability or even fraud (Kurniawan, 2021).

Second, social influence theory explains why reviews that show what a group of people thinks are more convincing (Filiari, 2015a). Reviews are often seen as social proof, especially by people who don't know much about a brand yet. A review profile can seem more real and more socially acceptable if it has a lot of reviews that are similar, votes that show how helpful the review was, and hints about who the reviewer is. Reputation is shaped not only by individual reviews but also by the fact that many other people have come to the same conclusion (Yongjun Xu, 2021).

Third, trust transfer theory shows that trust can move from the review system to the brand. When people think the review environment is open, verified, and well-run, they are more likely to trust the content and pass that trust on to the brand being reviewed. Conversely, suspicion of manipulation may damage both review credibility and brand credibility. This makes platform governance and verification systems part of modern reputation formation, not just neutral background conditions (Dellarocas, 2003).

The literature also demonstrates that online reviews influence consumer behavior through several mechanisms relevant to reputation (Kottler, 2017). Review valence remains a core factor because positive reviews usually strengthen quality perception and brand trust, while negative reviews often

create stronger risk signals and receive more diagnostic attention (Don, 2009). However, valence alone is insufficient. The perceived authenticity, helpfulness, and expertise of the reviewer, as well as the volume and specificity of the review, all play a role in how consumers see the review profile as meaningful and credible (Hanousek & Palda, 2004).

Authenticity has emerged as a notably significant aspect. Recent studies show that consumers check the authenticity of reviews by looking at balanced language, consistent reviewer histories, verified-purchase labels, realistic posting patterns, and specific narrative details. Even if the average star ratings stay high, fake reviews, AI-generated reviews, and over-the-top positivity can make people less trusting. As a result, authenticity operates as a strategic reputational resource in digital markets (Suhan et al., 2022)

Another important factor is how managers respond, because it shows how a brand acts when it is being watched. Responses that are quick, understanding, and focused on the problem may help protect your reputation by showing that you are responsible and service-oriented. On the other hand, defensive or generic responses can make criticism worse. The meaning of negative reviews therefore depends partly on how the brand reacts in public. Review management is not only a customer-service activity but also a form of reputational communication (Chevalier, 2003)

Reviews have the biggest effect on businesses where customers aren't sure what to buy, like hotels, restaurants, healthcare, cosmetics, online-only stores, and local services (Khandeparkar, 2025). The kind of platform is also important. Reviews on Amazon or marketplace product pages directly affect how many people buy something, while Google and Yelp reviews make it easier for people to find you in your area. Creator-led platforms combine consumer reviews with social and influencer communication. This shows that brand

reputation should be seen as a part of an ecosystem instead of just one channel's effect (F. Zhu, 2010) .

Table 1 :Main Literature Summary on Online Customer Reviews and Brand Reputation

Author	Context	Focus	Finding
Chevalier & Mayzlin (2006)	Online books	Review valence and sales	Positivity and volume of reviews influence market outcomes and signal quality.
Filieri (2015)	General e-commerce	Helpfulness and credibility	Review relevance, clarity, and credibility explain why some reviews are more persuasive.
Luca & Zervas (2016)	Yelp	Fake reviews	Suspicious review activity distorts trust and can harm reputation systems.
Hung et al. (2024)	Review-response settings	Managerial responses	Public responses affect later review dynamics and signal accountability.
Qiu et al. (2024)	Meta-analytic	Review effects on intention	Online reviews significantly influence consumer judgments across contexts.
Pocchiari et al. (2025)	Cross-platform review literature	Review research synthesis	Authenticity, governance, and platform variation are central future issues.

Source : Author, 2026

METHODS

Because the subject covers many fields and types of research , this study uses a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) . An SLR is a clearer and more repeatable way to find, screen , evaluate, and combine relevant evidence than a narrative review . The review is based on the PRISMA 2020 framework, which was chosen because it gives a clear way to find, screen, assess eligibility , and finally include studies (LEAVY, 2019) .

The literature search was conducted in Scopus, Web of Science, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar . Search strings combined important words like "electronic word of mouth," "brand reputation," "brand trust," "review credibility," "review helpfulness," "fake reviews," and "managerial responses ." The search window focused on studies

published between 2015 and 2025 , while several older foundational works were retained to support the theoretical background because they remain heavily cited in the field .

Inclusion criteria required that the study be written in English, published in a peer-reviewed journal or refereed conference proceeding, and explicitly address online reviews or closely related constructs in connection with brand reputation, trust, brand attitude, perceived quality, or loyalty. Exclusion criteria removed non-peer-reviewed material, inaccessible full texts, duplicates, purely technical sentiment-classification studies, and publications that discussed digital marketing without a direct link to review systems.

After screening, the final qualitative synthesis included 44 studies. A standardized extraction process recorded the author, year, context, theoretical lens, research design, focal review variables, and major findings from each study. The synthesis then grouped the evidence into recurring themes such as valence, volume, authenticity, reviewer expertise, managerial responses, and platform governance. This thematic approach made it possible to compare evidence from different sectors while preserving the conceptual structure of the user's original article (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

A quality appraisal was also conducted to ensure that the synthesis rested on methodologically credible work. Each study was assessed for clarity of objectives, design fit, transparency of data collection, analytical rigor, validity of conclusions, and relevance to the focal constructs. The review is systematic, but there are still some problems. The evidence base may not be complete because of bias against English-language studies, bias in publication, and the fact that AI-related manipulation research is moving quickly.

Table 2. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Written in English	Studies outside the main period or not relevant to the topic
Published in peer-reviewed journals/proceedings	Grey literature, opini, blog, editorial, dan sumber non-peer-reviewed
Discusses online reviews, eWOM, fake reviews, or management responses	Digital marketing studies without direct relevance to review systems
Examines outcomes related to brand reputation, trust, attitude, or loyalty	Technical sentiment classification studies without consumer/managerial implications
Presents empirical findings, theory, meta-analysis, or structured reviews	Duplicates, unavailable full text, theses, and dissertations

Source : Author, 2026

Table 3 . PRISMA 2020 Study Selection Summary

Stage	Description	Number
Identification	Records identified through database searching	n = 428
Identification	Additional records identified through reference lists and citation chaining	n = 22
Screening	Records after duplicates removed	n = 389
Screening	Records excluded after title and abstract review	n = 287
Eligibility	Full-text articles assessed for eligibility	n = 102
Eligibility	Full-text articles excluded	n = 58

Included	Studies included in final qualitative synthesis	n = 44
----------	---	--------

Source : Author, 2026

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The synthesis demonstrates that online customer reviews exert a significant and multifaceted impact on brand reputation . Across the reviewed studies , review valence remains the most visible signal because positive reviews strengthen perceived quality and trust , while negative reviews increase perceived risk and reduce confidence . However , the literature consistently shows that reputational outcomes are not determined by positivity alone . People decide if they trust and believe a review profile based on its volume, credibility, authenticity, helpfulness, and the reviewer's expertise .

One thing that keeps coming up is that detailed and balanced reviews are more useful than vague and extreme ones . Reviews that describe specific product or service experiences, include concrete examples, and show moderate emotionality are more likely to be considered helpful and trustworthy . These qualities increase the review's influence on overall brand evaluation. By contrast, repetitive praise, unsupported claims, or inconsistent score-text combinations often trigger suspicion and reduce the perceived legitimacy of the brand as well as the review source (Crant et al., 2011; Shi et al., 2020).

Authenticity is also a big part of building a brand's reputation . People are paying more attention to whether online reviews are real , whether the purchases behind them were real , and whether platforms do enough to find and get rid of suspicious activity . Brands can hurt their reputation not only by having unhappy customers , but also by giving the impression that their review systems are being tampered with. Authenticity is no longer just a technical issue in today's digital marketplace, which is very open . It is a very important part of a brand's reputation

Managerial responses significantly alter the reputational meaning of reviews. Several

studies indicate that timely , respectful , and problem-solving responses can reduce damage after negative feedback because they demonstrate accountability , empathy , and willingness to correct failures . Defensive , delayed , or overly scripted responses , on the other hand , can deepen dissatisfaction and make the brand appear indifferent . This shows that potential customers see how a brand responds to the public as a sign of its character , not just as a way to follow up on operations (Stella et al., 2025).

Platform context also matters. Reviews on marketplace product pages affect conversion and sales visibility, reviews on local search platforms influence discoverability and service reputation, and review-like communication on creator or social platforms blurs the boundary between peer testimony and promotional advocacy. Thus, the same brand may have different reputational signals across different platforms, and firms need to monitor these spaces as an interconnected review ecosystem rather than as isolated channels (Yusuf et al., 2020).

Another important result is that the impact of online reviews is especially strong in experience-based and high-risk categories such as hospitality, healthcare, cosmetics, travel, and online-only retail. In such sectors, consumers cannot fully verify quality before purchase, so they depend more heavily on other consumers' experiences. Under these conditions, reviews become a public substitute for direct trial and a key input into brand reputation formation. This also explains why managerial response quality and platform verification are particularly important where consumer uncertainty is high.

The literature also talks about how helpful reviews are and how knowledgeable the reviewers are . Reviews from experienced users, top contributors, or verified buyers are

often more helpful for diagnosis because they provide more evidence and seem more trustworthy . When helpful votes support this kind of content , the review has an even bigger impact on how people think about the brand as a whole . This indicates that reputation is affected not only by what is said, but also by which reviews become most visible and most socially validated on the platform (Forman et al., 2008; Lu et al., 2018; Ganguly et al., 2024).

Another thing that brings things together is reputational resilience . Companies that have a long history of getting honest reviews may be better at dealing with the odd bad review that comes up . Customers see occasional complaints as part of a larger pattern of good service . But brands with bad or suspicious reviews are more likely to hurt their own reputations . This means that

reputation in digital markets grows over time and is based on what has happened in the past . How reviews are written , how many there are , and how they are managed all affect how people understand new information.

The review also found some things that need more study . A lot of research still looks at trust or the desire to buy instead of reputation directly . Second , there aren't many comparisons between platforms yet, even though search engines , marketplaces , and social media all work with reputations in different ways . Third , we need to deal with new problems like fake reviews made by AI , algorithms for moderating reviews , and score-text inconsistency more directly . Longitudinal studies are still not very common, so it's hard to tell the difference between short-term changes in reputation and long-term changes .

Table 4. Review Factors that Most Influence Brand Reputation

Theme	Frequency	Finding	Implication
Review valence	High	Positive reviews strengthen perceived quality; negative reviews increase perceived risk.	Brands must respond quickly to patterns of negative complaints.
Review volume	High	A large number of reviews increases legitimacy, especially if they appear organic	Growth in review volume must be authentic and not manipulated
Credibility & authenticity	Very high	Detailed, balanced, and verified reviews are more trusted.	Verification and transparency should be part of reputation strategy.
Managerial response	High	Fast and specific responses can reduce reputational damage.	The quality of public responses signals brand character.
Platform governance	Medium	Moderation and verification labels influence trust in the review system.	Brand reputation also depends on platform credibility.

Source : Author, 2026

Table 5. Research Agenda and Practical Implications

Area	Gap	Implication
Reputation measurement	It is necessary to distinguish reputation from trust, attitude, and purchase intention	More specific reputation measurement instruments will improve the accuracy of findings.
Platform comparison	There are still limited cross-platform studies across Amazon, Google, Yelp, and social platforms	Brands need to manage the review ecosystem in an integrated manner
Authenticity threats	Fake reviews and AI-generated reviews are still rapidly increasing	Companies must invest in verification and fraud prevention
Longitudinal design	Long-term evidence remains limited.	Longitudinal studies are needed to observe changes in reputation over time

Source : Author, 2026

Overall, the evidence indicates that online reviews are now a core reputational mechanism in digital markets. They shape what consumers believe about a brand, how much risk they associate with it, and whether they interpret the brand as reliable, responsive, and legitimate. For that reason, firms that want durable brand reputation must manage review environments ethically and strategically rather than treating reviews as passive feedback archives.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that online customer reviews significantly and enduringly influence brand perception. The effect can happen in many ways, such as the review's valence, volume, credibility, authenticity, helpfulness, the reviewer's expertise, the manager's responses, and the platform's governance. People trust a product and think it's good when they read good, believable reviews. But if a business doesn't respond well to bad reviews or if they seem suspicious, they can quickly hurt the business's reputation. The results show that a brand's online reputation is affected by more than just what it says about

itself. It is also influenced by public reviews and the review system itself.

The research indicates that overseeing reviews ought to be regarded as an essential aspect of brand management. Firms should encourage verified and experience-based reviews, respond promptly and transparently to complaints, monitor suspicious patterns, and work with platforms that support review authenticity. These actions help protect both review trust and brand trust. In fields with a lot of uncertainty, like hospitality, online retail, healthcare, and local services, these kinds of strategies are even more important because customers rely on reviews from other people before making a purchase.

For future research, more direct measurement of brand reputation is needed, along with cross-platform comparison and longitudinal analysis. Researchers should also examine the consequences of AI-generated reviews, algorithmic moderation, and score-text inconsistency more closely. Practically, companies should move beyond the goal of collecting more reviews and instead focus on cultivating a credible review ecosystem. Sustainable brand reputation depends on

authentic customer experience, ethical review governance, and consistent organizational accountability .

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Ardisa, A. U., Afi, Safitri, S., Rohmalia, Y., & Asbari, M. (2025). Strategi Penguatan Daya Saing UMKM Konveksi Melalui Analisis SWOT Dan Digitalisasi Pemasaran: Studi Kasus Pada Konveksi D'Stiny Tigaraksa. *Niswantara: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 2(01), 10–15.
<https://doi.org/10.70508/Jydf389>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis In Psychology. *Qualitative Research In Psychology*, 3, 77–101.
<https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Chevalier, J. A. (2003). THE EFFECT OF WORD OF MOUTH ON SALES. *NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH*, 10.
- Crant, J. M., Kim, T. Y., & Wang, J. (2011). Dispositional Antecedents Of Demonstration And Usefulness Of Voice Behavior. *Journal Of Business And Psychology*, 26(3), 285–297.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/S10869-010-9197-Y>
- Dellarocas, C. (2003). THE DIGITIZATION OF WORD-OF-MOUTH: PROMISE AND CHALLENGES OF ONLINE FEEDBACK MECHANISMS. *Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection*, 1(March).
- Don, T. (2009). Grown Up Digital: How The Net Generation Is Changing Your World. *International Journal Of Advertising*, 28(1), 182–184.
<https://doi.org/10.2501/S0265048709090490>
- Filieri, R. (2015a). What Makes Information In Online Consumer Reviews Diagnostic Over Time? The Role Of Review Relevancy, Factuality, Currency, Source Credibility And Ranking Score. *Journal Of Business Research*, 68(6), 1–39.
- Filieri, R. (2015b). What Makes Online Reviews Helpful? A Diagnosticity-Adoption Framework To Explain Informational And Normative Influences In E-WOM. *Journal Of Business Research*, 68(6), 1261–1270.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.Jbusres.2014.11.006>
- Hanousek, J., & Palda, F. (2004). Quality Of Government Services And The Civic Duty To Pay Taxes In The Czech And Slovak Republics, And Other Transition Countries. *Kyklos*, 57(2), 237–252.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/J.0023-5962.2004.00252.X>
- Hennig-Thurau, T., Eifler, V., Hennig-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K. P., & Gremler, D. D. (2004). ELECTRONIC WORD-OF-MOUTH VIA CONSUMER-OPINION PLATFORMS: WHAT MOTIVATES CONSUMERS TO ARTICULATE THEMSELVES ON THE INTERNET? *JOURNAL OF INTERACTIVE MARKETING*, 18(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1002/Dir.10073>
- Jamal, T., Zahid, M., Martins, J. M., Mata, M. N., Rahman, H. U., & Mata, P. N. (2021). Perceived Green Human Resource Management Practices And Corporate Sustainability: Multigroup Analysis And Major Industries Perspectives. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 13(6), 1–17.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/Su13063045>
- Khandeparkar, K. (2025). Fake-Love : Brand Love For Counterfeits. *Marketing Intelligence And Planning*, 36(6), 661–677. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MIP-11-2017-0278>
- Kim, S. C.-O. & J. H. (2022). Exploring The Dimensions Of Media Brand Trust: A Contemporary Integrative Approach. *Journal Of Media Business Studies*, 27(1), 109–135.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254X.2018.1466828>
- Kostritsa, M., Liebl, H., Beinhauer, R., & Turčínková, J. (2020). CONSUMER BRAND LOVE FOR LUXURY BRANDS IN INDIA. *ACTA UNIVERSITATIS AGRICULTURAE ET*

- SILVICULTURAE MENDELIANAE BRUNENSIS*, 68(1), 189–197. <https://doi.org/10.11118/Actaun202068010189>
- Kottler. (2017). Marketing. In *Organizacija* (Vol. 6, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.11118/Actaun202068010189>
- Kurniawan, Q. B. (2021). IMPLEMENTASI KEBIJAKAN PENGADAAN BARANG DAN JASA SECARA ELEKTRONIK PADA PEMERINTAH KOTA SURABAYA. *Publika*, 9(3), 257–266.
- LEAVY, P. (2019). Quantitative, Qualitative, Mixed Methods, Arts-Based, And Community-Based Participatory Research Approaches. In *THE GUILFORD PRESS* (Vol. 11, Issue 1). <http://scioteca.caf.com/bitstream/handle/123456789>
- Rakhmanita, A., Hurriyati, R., Disman, D., Hendrayati, H., & Susilawati, E. (2023). The Driver Of Purchase Intentions In Omnichannel Retail: Perceived Value Examination. *Journal Of Eastern European And Central Asian Research*, 10(4), 650–658. <https://doi.org/10.15549/Jeecar.V10i4.1360>
- Ramsaroop, S., & Petersen, N. (2020). Building Professional Competencies Through A Service Learning ‘Gallery Walk’ In Primary School Teacher Education. *Journal Of University Teaching And Learning Practice*, 17(4), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.17.4.3>
- Shi, S., Wang, Y., Chen, X., & Zhang, Q. (2020). Conceptualization Of Omnichannel Customer Experience And Its Impact On Shopping Intention: A Mixed-Method Approach. *International Journal Of Information Management*, 50(February 2019), 325–336. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.09.001>
- Stella, H., Junyeong, C., Chanhee, L., & Jinyoung, K. (2025). The Role Of Review Responses In Shaping Online Review Content And Review Space Dynamics. *Electronic Markets*, 35(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-025-00845-0>
- Suhan, M., Nayak, S., Nayak, R., Spulbar, C., Bai, G. V., Birau, R., Anghel, L. C., & Stanciu, C. V. (2022). Exploring The Sustainable Effect Of Mediation Role Of Brand Commitment And Brand Trust On Brand Loyalty: An Empirical Study. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istrazivanja*, 35(1), 6422–6444. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2022.2048202>
- Yongjun Xu. (2021). Artificial Intelligence : A Powerful Paradigm For Scientific Research. *The Innovation*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xinn.2021.100179>
- Yusuf; Ramayani; Hendrayati, Heny; Dewi, Riana; Nurdin, J. (2020). E-SERVQUAL: HOW COULD E-SERVQUAL AFFECT THE SATISFACTION OF SHOPEE MOBILE APPLICATION USERS? *BGCME UPI*, 69(1), 833–837.
- Yusuf, R., Ahmaddien, I., Hernawati, E., & Dudi, E. (2020). *THE INFLUENCE OF PROMOTION, PRODUCT QUALITY TOWARDS CUSTOMER SATISFACTION WITH CUSTOMER TRUST AS MODERATION VARIABLES*.
- Zhu, F. (2010). Impact Of Online Consumer Reviews On Sales: The Moderating Role Of Product And Consumer. *Journal Of Marketing*, 74(March), 133–148.
- Zhu, G. (2019). Precision Retail Marketing Strategy Based On Digital Marketing Model. *Science Journal Of Business And Management*, 7(1), 33. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.sjbm.20190701.15>