



Paper: “The Complexity of E-Marketing and Its Influence on the Performance of Gas Companies in Tanzania: Insights from Innovation Diffusion Theory”

Submitted: 21 May 2025

Accepted: 28 October 2025

Published: 31 October 2025

Corresponding Author: Augustino Yohana

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n28p64

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Olasunkanmi Olusogo Olagunju
University of Lagos, Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 07.10.2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 08.10.2025
Manuscript Title: The Complexity of E-Marketing and Its Influence on the Performance of Gas Companies in Tanzania: Insights from Innovation Diffusion Theory	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. (Please insert your comments)	5
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. (Please insert your comments)	3
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. (Please insert your comments)	3
4. The study methods are explained clearly. (Please insert your comments)	5
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. (Please insert your comments)	3
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- 1) The introduction frames “complexity” mainly as a negative barrier, but the findings show a positive impact on performance. This creates a theoretical inconsistency.
- 2) Rogers (2003) in IDT emphasizes that complexity slows adoption, yet your findings show the opposite. This contradiction is not sufficiently explained.
- 3) H1 is formulated as “complexity has positive and significant influence” without theoretical justification. (-Suggestion: H1: The perceived complexity of e-marketing significantly influences the performance of gas companies in Tanzania.
-Leave the direction (positive/negative) open to empirical testing, which will resolve the current contradiction.)
- 4) COMPL3 and COMPL4 were dropped from the CFA, but parts of the paper still refer to a five-factor model.
- 5) Path coefficients are reported inconsistently (e.g., $\gamma = 0.206, 0.166, 0.388$ in different sections).
- 6) Numerical findings are detailed, but the theoretical interpretation is limited.
- 7) The conclusion includes practical advice but lacks explicit academic contribution.
- 8) Tables are overly detailed and fragmented.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title “Complexity of Electronic Marketing towards Performance of Gas Energy Companies in Tanzania: Insight from Innovation Diffusion Theory” is precise, descriptive, and matches the study’s scope. I consider the title clear and adequate.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract clearly states the objective (to investigate complexity of electronic marketing and performance), methods (structured questionnaire, explanatory design, SEM analysis), and results (positive correlation and recommendations).

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are a few grammatical errors. I will suggest that the authors review the paper and correct all necessary grammatical errors.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods are well explained: research design, sample (302 respondents), data collection (structured questionnaires), and analysis . However, what is your justification for the sample technique?

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The paper is generally clear and logically structured (Introduction, Literature Review, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion). However, ensure that some paragraphs that may appear dense and contain repetitive sentences are simplified. Tables and figures are referenced, but formatting could be improved. Also you mention table 4.9??? Where is the table?

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is consistent with the findings (positive but moderate relationship between complexity and performance).

It provides practical recommendations (training, simplified systems, user-friendly design). However, some points in the conclusion repeat earlier discussion sections. A more concise summary would strengthen impact.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference list is comprehensive, mostly recent articles were cited, and relevant to electronic marketing, complexity, and innovation diffusion.

However, there are one or two inconsistencies. Kindly ensure that APA 7th Edition. is followed.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

*Please rate the **METHODS** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article is strong in title clarity, methodology, and relevance. The abstract, methods, and references are adequate, but the paper would benefit from minor proofreading, improved conciseness, and formatting consistency.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

No, there is need to reframe the topic

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

No, the abstract needs a critical review in order to cover the introduction, main research objective, theoretical framework chosen, methodology, result, conclusion and recommendation

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes, the paper should be properly review and edited to remove few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

No, the research method did not capture the essential element and sub-elements.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

No, the body of the work needs serious review and modifications. The literature Review is not sufficiently addressing the issue raised.

The introduction deviates from the subject-matter a lot.

The theoretical framework is not linked to the literature, objectives and no provision to address the research questions.

The body of the work omitted problem statement, research objectives, scope of study.

The result and discussion do not align with the subject-matter of the topic.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

No, more corrections are needed to align the conclusion with the body of the work.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference list is fair but in-text citations should be adjusted.

No effort is made to link the result and discussion to literature and answer the research questions.

In-text citations require proper adjustments

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The topic is highly important and relevant but the research paper does not address both independent and dependent variables rigorously.

Review the topic by joining the independent and dependent variable with "and" or "on"

For instance, "effect of electronic marketing on performance...."

Create at least 3 research objectives.

Build your literature Review on these objectives and ensure you establish gaps in recent research that your personal research questions will address.

Choose at least 1 theory and link it with your research objectives.

Rework your result and discussion to align with your literatures.

Work on your methodology, conclusion and others.
