

## EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>Below are concise, quoted fixes, organized by page and paragraph numbers. I referenced the manuscript as provided (assuming the title page = p.1). Please adjust page numbers if your typeset version differs.</p> <p>p.1, Abstract, para 2</p> <p>“By implementing a content marketing matrix strategy... using a descriptive quantitative approach through ad performance metrics (CTR and CPC).” → “Reclassify the design and specify primary/secondary outcomes; add conversion definition and CPA.” Fix: “We conducted a 3-day randomized A/B ad test; primary outcome: conversion rate and CPA; secondary: CTR, CPC. Conversion defined as [lead form/WhatsApp click/contract], 7D click attribution.”</p> <p>p.1, Abstract, para 3</p> <p>“achieved the highest engagement, with a click-through rate (CTR) of 4.67% and a cost-per-click (CPC) of as little as Rp 307” → “Report sample sizes, impressions, clicks, and confidence intervals; avoid superlatives with small-N.” Fix: “CTR 4.67% (95% CI: x-y) from n=... clicks / ... impressions; CPC IDR 307; CPA IDR ....”</p> <p>p.2, Introduction, para 2</p> <p>“Datareportal, 2025” vs References “We Are Social (2025)” → Harmonize citation. Fix: “(We Are Social &amp; Kepios, 2025)” and match reference title/URL.</p> <p>p.2, Introduction, para 3</p> <p>“consisting of four types of content: educational, inspirational, entertainment, and convince” → Typo/construct definition missing. Fix: “educate, inspire, entertain, and convince”; add operational criteria.</p> <p>p.3, Literature Review, para 2</p> <p>“Chaffey, D. (2015) explains that brand identity...” → Misattribution; this is branding/identity literature (Aaker/Keller). Fix the claim or citation. Provide precise page or move to correct source.</p> <p>p.3, Literature Review, para 3</p> <p>“Content marketing matrix by Smart Insights (2012)” → Missing formal citation details/date. Fix: add authoring entity/year formatting; if no author, use “Smart Insights. (2012). Content Marketing Matrix. URL.”</p> <p>p.4, Objectives, list</p> <p>Objectives 1–3 are overlapping and not testable. Fix: rewrite as RQs/Hs. Example: “H1: Educate/Inspire yield higher CTR and lower CPC than Entertain/Convince.” “H2: Educate/Inspire yield higher conversion rate and lower CPA.”</p>	<p><b>p.1, Abstract, para 2</b></p> <p>We conducted a 3-day randomized A/B ad test. The primary outcomes in this study are conversion rate and cost per acquisition (CPA), while secondary outcomes include click-through rate (CTR) and cost per click (CPC). Conversions were defined as a click that leads to service booking form, WhatsApp message, or partnership contract with 7D click attribution.</p> <p><b>p.1, Abstract, para 3</b></p> <p>The results showed that educate matrix trial obtained a CTR of 4.67% (95% CI: 3.92-5.42) from 7 clicks for 150 impressions, with a CPC of IDR 307 and a CPA of IDR 60,000 which directly contributed to new clients for its Brand Identity services.</p> <p><b>p.2, Introduction, para 2</b></p> <p>(We Are Social &amp; Kepios, 2025)</p> <p><b>p.2, Introduction, para 3</b></p> <p>educate (information, tutorials, or tips about branding and creative design), inspire (success stories, moodboards, or motivational messages), entertain (engaging through trends, humor, or participatory formats), and convince (calls to purchase, testimonials, or service offers that directly drive conversions)</p> <p><b>p.3, Literature Review, para 2</b></p> <p>Keller, K. L. (2020) explains that brand identity is the totality of brand associations, including the name and symbols that must be communicated. This study also explains how marketing communications must ...</p> <p><b>p.3, Literature Review, para 3</b></p> <p>Smart Insights. (2012). <i>The Content marketing matrix</i>. <a href="https://www.smartinsights.com/content-management/content-marketing-strategy/the-content-marketing-matrix-new-infographic/">https://www.smartinsights.com/content-management/content-marketing-strategy/the-content-marketing-matrix-new-infographic/</a></p>

## EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

<p>p.5, Methodology, para 1</p> <p>“qualitative descriptive approach” while using CTR/CPC → Design mismatch. Fix: “quantitative descriptive case study with experimental ad cells” or “mixed methods” if adding qualitative coding.</p> <p>p.5, Methodology, para 2</p> <p>“three variables to measure engagement” lists matrix, branding identity, sales → Constructs not operationalized. Fix: define measures: “Brand identity awareness index (survey or branded search), conversion event = ..., CPA = spend/conversions.”</p> <p>p.6, Results &amp; Discussion, para 1</p> <p>Claims “month-over-month revenue increases” without data. Fix: add table/figure with monthly revenue and variance or remove.</p> <p><b>p.6–7, Table 1 caption and body</b></p> <p>“Frequence,” “Educative,” inconsistent CPC/CTR vs text; missing impressions, clicks, spend. Fix: standardize labels (“Frequency,” “Educate”); add columns: Impressions, Clicks, Spend, CTR, CPC, Conversions, CPA; ensure unit “IDR”; reconcile numbers with text.</p> <p>p.7, Results, para after Table 1</p> <p>“resulting in two new customers” → Define attribution and evidence. Fix: “2 conversions attributed under 7D click; CPA = IDR ...; verification: CRM IDs ...”</p> <p>p.7–8, Table 2</p> <p>Mixed languages (“Portofolio,” “Inspire &amp; Educate tertinggi”), incomplete dates, and inconsistent CPC (text says Entertain CPC IDR 254 vs Table IDR 240). Fix: unify English terms, exact dates, reconcile CPC, add spend and conversions.</p> <p>p.8, Section 3.2, para 1</p> <p>“Educate... most effective in driving sales... Through this Inspire content, Studio Dakssa generated two new customers...” → Intra-paragraph contradiction. Fix: clearly attribute which content drove which conversions; separate Educate vs Inspire outcomes; include CPA.</p> <p>p.9, Section 3.3, para 1</p> <p>“lowest cost-per-click of Rp 307 and 9 profile visits” → Profile visits ≠ conversions; avoid interpreting as sales impact. Fix: report conversion metrics or rephrase as upper-funnel effect.</p> <p>p.10, Fig. 1</p>	<p><b>p.4, Objectives, list</b></p> <p>H1: Educate/Inspire yield higher CTR and lower CPC than Entertain/Convince.</p> <p>H2: Educate/Inspire yield higher conversion rate and lower CPA.</p> <p><b>p.5, Methodology, para 1</b></p> <p>This research was designed as a descriptive quantitative case study with experimental ad cells. Operationally, Studio Dakssa ran a three-day A/B ad trial using Meta Business Suite. Eight ad cells (8 creatives) were structured based on four content types from the content marketing matrix (Educate, Inspire, Entertain, Convince) and two audience segments (Interest+Demographic vs Custom Audience). Budget allocation was set evenly per cell (Rp20,000/day per cell × 3 days → Rp60,000 per cell).</p> <p><b>p.5, Methodology, para 2</b></p> <p>The primary objective of this experiment was to assess the effectiveness of content types on ad performance, measured through primary and secondary variables. Primary variables included conversion rate and cost-per-acquisition (CPA), while secondary variables included click-through rate (CTR), cost-per-click (CPC), impressions, clicks, and cost per cell (spend). Conversions were operationally defined as actions demonstrating commercial intent, such as clicking on a WhatsApp business message inquiry button, completing a lead form, or confirming a service order. All conversions were measured using a 7-day click attribution window to ensure attribution accuracy. Data was obtained directly from Meta Ads Manager and verified through WhatsApp Business conversation logs. Analysis was conducted descriptively to display per-cell and aggregate metrics, including impressions, clicks, CTR, CPC, conversions, and CPA. Proportional values such as CTR and conversion rate were reported with 95% confidence intervals to reflect estimation uncertainty, while CPA was calculated based on the actual total budget per ad cell.</p> <p><b>p.6, Results &amp; Discussion, para 1</b></p>
---	--

## EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

<p>Figure is referenced but not included. Fix: insert creatives grid with thumbnails, copy, CTA, placement; add an Appendix with campaign settings.</p> <p>p.11, Policy and Implications, para 2</p> <p>“regular performance review policy” → Specify cadence and metrics. Fix: “biweekly; metrics: CPA, conv. rate, ROAS; decision rules for budget reallocation.”</p> <p>p.12, Major Findings, para 1</p> <p>“Educational and Convincing content achieved the highest engagement (4.8% on average)” contradicts earlier sections emphasizing Educate/Inspire. Fix: harmonize findings; present a single ranked order with supporting data.</p> <p>p.13, Conclusion, para 2</p> <p>“achieved the most efficient CPC and the highest CTR” → Add denominators and avoid causal language. Fix: “observed lower CPC and higher CTR over 3 days; exploratory.”</p> <p>p.14, Limitations, para 1</p> <p>Good start but vague next steps. Fix: add “randomized split by content type x audience; ≥2-week flight; holdout for incrementality; server-side conversion API.”</p> <p><b>p.15–16, References</b></p> <p>Standardize APA 7th: titles in sentence case, italics for books/journals, DOIs where available, consistent author initials.</p> <p>“Smart Insights. (2012). Content marketing matrix. <a href="https://www.smartinsights.com/">https://www.smartinsights.com/</a>” → add exact page title and retrieval date if required.</p> <p><b>“We Are Social. (2025...)” → match in-text as We Are Social &amp; Kepios; include full report title, publisher note, URL.</b></p> <p>“Kierzkowski et al., 1996” McKinsey Quarterly entry incomplete; verify volume/issue/pages.</p> <p>Suggested decision: Major revisions required before the work can be considered for publication.</p>	<p>‘Meanwhile, on the financial side, the company reported month-over-month revenue increases, demonstrating operational efficiency and strong commercial growth.’ was removed</p> <p><b>p.6–7, Table 1 caption and body</b></p> <p>was add &amp; revised.</p> <p><b>p.7, Results, para after Table 1</b></p> <p>resulting in two conversions were attributed under 7-day click attribution, with an average Cost per Acquisition (CPA) of IDR 240,000, verified through CRM client records.</p> <p><b>p.7–8, Table 2</b></p> <p>To inform conversion, I added total ad spend info in the notes column.</p> <p><b>p.8, Section 3.2, para 1</b></p> <p>Of the four content marketing matrix types (educate, inspire, entertain, and convince/service), both Educate and Inspire content types demonstrated measurable contributions to Branding Identity service sales. The Educate (Interest + Demographic) content recorded a CPC of Rp307 and generated one verified conversion; while the Inspire content also generated one conversion (CPC recorded according to campaign data). With a budget allocation of Rp60,000 per content piece over three days, each conversion equates to a Cost per Acquisition (CPA) of Rp60,000 per client. When calculated at the aggregate campaign level (total spend of Rp480,000 for eight content pieces and two conversions), the average campaign CPA reached Rp240,000 per client. All conversions were attributed using 7-day click attribution and were verified through WhatsApp business conversation recordings and Studio Dakssa’s internal CRM records, demonstrating the link between advertising activity and sales results.</p>
---	--

## EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

	<p><b>p.9, Section 3.3, para 1</b></p> <p>Based on the ad trial results, the Educate content emerged as the most efficient content marketing strategy, recording the lowest cost-per-click (CPC) of Rp307 and generating 9 profile visits. While profile visits do not directly translate to sales, this data indicates that educational content is able to attract a relevant audience with high interest in the information and solutions offered by Studio Dakssa. Meanwhile, the Inspire content showed the highest performance in terms of reach with 126 profile visits and a CPC of Rp345, which plays a crucial role in the upper funnel stage in expanding brand awareness and building initial interest in the service. The effectiveness of both types of content then contributed to the creation of two new conversions for the Branding Identity service during the three-day ad trial period from August 20–23, 2025, which was further verified through conversational interactions and Studio Dakssa CRM records.</p> <p><b>p.10, Fig. 1</b></p> <p>was added.</p> <p><b>p.11, Policy and Implications, para 2</b></p> <p>Studio Dakssa should implement a biweekly performance review policy, focusing on key metrics such as Cost-Per-Acquisition (CPA), conversion rate, and Return on Ad Spend (ROAS). This evaluation will guide budget reallocation decisions for future campaigns, ensuring resources are focused on the most effective content types and audience segments.</p> <p><b>p.12, Major Findings, para 1</b></p> <p>From June to August 2025, eight pieces of content were produced and categorized into the four quadrants of the content marketing matrix: Educate, Inspire, Entertain, and Convince. Based on engagement and conversion data, Educate and Inspire content demonstrated the highest overall performance, achieving an average</p>
--	--

## EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

	<p>engagement rate of 4.8% and generating two verified client conversions for the Branding Identity service.</p> <p><b>p.13, Conclusion, para 2</b></p> <p>Campaign data showed that Educate and Inspire content achieved lower cost-per-click (CPC) and higher click-through rates (CTR) over a three-day period, with the Educate content achieving a CTR of 4.67% from 150 impressions and 7 clicks, while the Inspire content achieved a CTR of 3.9% from 200 impressions and 8 clicks. These engagements were associated with two new clients for its Brand Identity services.</p> <p><b>p.14, Limitations, para 1</b></p> <p>However, further research is recommended to extend the observation period to at least two weeks and implement a randomized split based on content type x audience to strengthen internal validity. In addition, the use of a holdout group to measure incrementality and the implementation of a server-side conversion API are recommended to improve data accuracy and conversion attribution. Therefore, further research could also add variables such as customer satisfaction, brand loyalty, and advertising cost-effectiveness, and conduct comparisons across creative industries to examine differences in effectiveness based on market characteristics and service type. Through these methodological enhancements, future studies are expected to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the strategic role of content marketing in supporting business growth in the digital era.</p>
--	---