

How to Fix the Citation Problems

Cui et al. also verify this conclusion.

it should be

Cui, et al. (2020) also verify this conclusion.

Note:,Brand Trust(BT), Emotional Commitment(ECM), and Continuous Commitment(CCM).

should be

Note: Brand Trust (BT), Emotional Commitment (ECM), and Continuous Commitment (CCM).

services from a company(Kumar et al., 2010; Liao & Wong, 2008)).

Should be

services from a **company (Kumar, et al., 2010; Liao & Wong, 2008).**

brand trust(Ahn & Yang, 2021,pp:12).

Should be

brand trust (Ahn & Yang, 2021, p12).

The paper some problems in the citations, e.g.

The authors have used both

(R. J. Cohen, 2014)

And

(J. Cohen, 2013)

Because there are 2 papers:

Cohen, J. (2013). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Academic press.

Cohen, R. J. (2014). Brand personification: Introduction and overview. *Psychology & Marketing*, 31(1), 1–30.

They can use both

(R. J. Cohen, 2014)

And

(J. Cohen, 2014)

That's fine if the 2 papers are

Cohen, J. (2014). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Academic press.

Cohen, R. J. (2014). Brand personification: Introduction and overview. *Psychology & Marketing*, 31(1), 1–30.

But now, the papers are

1) Cohen, J. (2013). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Academic press.

2) Cohen, R. J. (2014). Brand personification: Introduction and overview. *Psychology & Marketing*, 31(1), 1–30.

Then, the authors can just use

(Cohen, 2013) or Cohen (2013) for (1) and use

(Cohen, 2014) or Cohen (2014) for (2).

1) The authors wrote

In Ramesh and Rajumesh (2015) study, they tried to analysis the impact of political events on market efficiency in the stock exchange of Colombo. He used data of 40 political events from the period 2008 to 2012.

First,

In Ramesh and Rajumesh (2015) study,

Is wrong, it should be

In Ramesh and Rajumesh's (2015) study,

But then "In Ramesh and Rajumesh's (2015) study", we cannot use "they" or "he". The authors should say something like

- a) In Ramesh and Rajumesh's (2015) study, the authors analyzed the impact of political events on market efficiency in the stock exchange of Colombo by using data containing 40 political events from the period from 2008 to 2012.

Or it is more common to say

- b) Ramesh and Rajumesh (2015) analyzed the impact of political events on market efficiency in the stock exchange of Colombo by using data containing 40 political events from the period from 2008 to 2012.

I am not sure that the authors prefer a or b.

The authors should check all references and citations carefully, e.g.

Veda, V. R. B., & Sathish, A. S. (2022). Delineation on Celebrity Endorsement and Brand Mascot Towards Attitudes, Beliefs, Purchase Intention and Behaviour of the Consumers. *International Journal of Academic and Practical Research*, *Delineation on Celebrity Endorsement and Brand Mascot Towards Attitudes, Beliefs, Purchase Intention and Behaviour of the Consumers (January 13, 2023)*. *International Journal of Academic and Practi*, 1(2), 77–89.

Is not correct

For

. (Hair Jr, et al., 2017; Hair, et al., 2019).

No need to use this

Since

Hair, J., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Gudergan, S. P. (2017). *Advanced issues in partial least squares structural equation modeling*. saGe publications.

Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24.

Authors can use

. (Hair, et al., 2017; Hair, et al., 2019).

By the study of Gill, et al. (2015) promoter ownership is often regarded as concentrated board ownership by relatives, family members, and friends.

This is a very poor writing. If the authors want to write in this way, at least they have to say

a) By the study of Gill, et al. (2015), promoter ownership is often regarded as concentrated board ownership by relatives, family members, and friends.

A better way is

b) Gill, et al. (2015) find that promoter ownership is often regarded as concentrated board ownership by relatives, family members, and friends.

The authors wrote

Wang and Wong, et al. (2023)

(Wang & Sohail, et al., 2023).

For

Wang, F., Sohail, A., Wong, W. K., Azim, Q. U. A., Farwa, S., & Sajad, M. (2023). Artificial intelligence and stochastic optimization algorithms for the chaotic datasets. *FRACTALS (fractals)*, 31(06), 1-14.

Wang, F., Wong, W. K., Ortiz, G. G. R., Al Shraah, A., Mabrouk, F., Li, J., & Li, Z. (2023). Economic analysis of sustainable exports value addition through natural resource management and artificial intelligence. *Resources Policy*, 82, 103541.

I think it should be

Wang, Wong, et al. (2023)

(Wang, Sohail, et al., 2023).

The authors wrote

(refer to Figure 1) (Vyas, et al., 2023).

This is not a good way to writing. The authors should avoid to get such writing in their paper, e.g. in this paper, they say

The landscape of retail e-commerce witnessed substantial growth, reaching nearly \$506 billion compared to the preceding year (refer to Figure 1) (Vyas, et al., 2023)

To avoid it, the authors could write

Referring to Figure 1, the landscape of retail e-commerce witnessed substantial growth, reaching nearly \$506 billion compared to the preceding year (Vyas, et al., 2023).

The study of Chiu, et al. (2019) has added that the board ownership structure has a significant positive relationship with the firm's excessive cash holdings that can be there under corporate finance and can also be treated as a higher association between the firm's value.

Is bad and the sentence becomes very complicated, no good.

Just say

Chiu, et al. (2019) have included the board ownership structure in the study and have shown that the board ownership structure has a significant positive relationship with the firm's excessive cash holdings. xxxx.

And fill in xxxx. Kindly tell them to use simple English to write except the authors' writing in English is excellent.

it is ok to use it once in a while if the sentence is still simple but all sentences in this paper are very complicated, using "The study of" in the paper makes it more complicated. No good.

the writing of

The concept of anthropomorphism has garnered substantial attention in recent years. In the discourse surrounding anthropomorphism and brand personification, (Delbaere, et al., 2011) observed that advertisements portraying human product characteristics could trigger anthropomorphism and heighten brand affinity (Aggarwal & McGill, 2012).

Is bad. Firstly, it should be

The concept of anthropomorphism has garnered substantial attention in recent years. For example, in the discourse surrounding anthropomorphism and brand personification, Delbaere, et al. (2011) observed that advertisements portraying human product characteristics could trigger anthropomorphism and heighten brand affinity (Aggarwal & McGill, 2012).

But this is still no good. it is better to write it as

The concept of anthropomorphism has garnered substantial attention in recent years. For example, in the discourse surrounding anthropomorphism and brand personification, Delbaere, et al. (2011) and Aggarwal & McGill (2012) observed that advertisements portraying human product characteristics could trigger anthropomorphism and heighten brand affinity.

Or

The concept of anthropomorphism has garnered substantial attention in recent years. For example, in the discourse surrounding anthropomorphism and brand personification, Delbaere, et al. (2011) observed that advertisements portraying human product characteristics could trigger anthropomorphism and heighten brand affinity.

I believe the authors could use (Aggarwal & McGill, 2012) to refer to heighten brand affinity.

If this is the case, the authors should write it in another sentence.

the authors use

(F. Suleman, 2018).

D. Suleman and Zuniarti (2019)

We just use

(Suleman, 2018).

Suleman and Zuniarti (2019)

The authors can use what they write if they can send us some papers published in top journals using the same way as they did.

The authors wrote

(refer to Figure 1) (Vyas, et al., 2023).

Wang and Wong, et al. (2023)

(Wang & Sohail, et al., 2023).

For

Wang, F., Sohail, A., Wong, W. K., Azim, Q. U. A., Farwa, S., & Sajad, M. (2023). Artificial intelligence and stochastic optimization algorithms for the chaotic datasets. *FRACTALS (fractals)*, 31(06), 1-14.

Wang, F., Wong, W. K., Ortiz, G. G. R., Al Shraah, A., Mabrouk, F., Li, J., & Li, Z. (2023). Economic analysis of sustainable exports value addition through natural resource management and artificial intelligence. *Resources Policy*, 82, 103541.

I think it should be

Wang, Wong, et al. (2023)

(Wang, Sohail, et al., 2023).

The quality of teacher performance will improve both the process and the educational outcomes by Al-ghanabousi and Idris (2010).

Should be

either

Al-ghanabousi and Idris (2010) find that the quality of teacher performance will improve both the process and the educational outcomes.

Or

The quality of teacher performance will improve both the process and the educational outcomes (Al-ghanabousi and Idris, 2010).

In planning a decision academic supervision program, the principal must integrate it with other academic and non-academic activities at the school in Mustafid and Khairuddin (2016).

Should be

Either

Mustafid and Khairuddin (2016) find that in planning a decision academic supervision program, the principal must integrate it with other academic and non-academic activities at the school.

Or

In planning a decision academic supervision program, the principal must integrate it with other academic and non-academic activities at the school (Mustafid and Khairuddin, 2016).

If a person's morals are upset, they will feel stress and poor performance in real-world settings by Suhron, et al. (2020); Yusuf, et al. (2019).

Should be

If a person's morals are upset, they will feel stress and poor performance in real-world settings (Suhron, et al., 2020; Yusuf, et al., 2019).

Our results offer important insights into the process through which supervisors make discretionary control decisions and contribute to the understanding of the forces that shape managerial controls within organizations by Wang and Yin (2023).

Should be

Consistent with the finding obtained by Wang and Yin (2023), our results offer important insights into the process through which supervisors make discretionary control decisions and contribute to the understanding of the forces that shape managerial controls within organizations.

a) and, thus,

to be

b) , and thus,

B is saver

1) You have many “in” problems, e.g.

As a supervisor, the principal drives and leads the implementation of academic supervision to improve teacher performance in Juharyanto, et al. (2023).

Should be

As a supervisor, the principal drives and leads the implementation of academic supervision to improve teacher performance (Juharyanto, et al., 2023).

Or

Juharyanto, et al. (2023) suggested that as a supervisor, the principal drives and leads the implementation of academic supervision to improve teacher performance.

Note:,Brand Trust(BT), Emotional Commitment(ECM), and Continuous Commitment(CCM).

should be

Note: Brand Trust (BT), Emotional Commitment (ECM), and Continuous Commitment (CCM).

There are some citation problems also, e.g.

(Ramadan, A., and Pasha Safavi, H, 2022).

should be

(Ramadan, A., & Pasha Safavi, H, 2022).

organizations (Wang L, 2023)

should be

organizations (Wang, 2023)

difficulty (Wong, W. K. (2020); Wong, W. K, 2022)

should be

difficulty (Wong, 2020, 2022)

In [1],

should be

In Chen, et al. (2020),

One promising technique proposed by X. Yu, Y. Wang, and X. Wang

should be

One promising technique proposed by Yu, et al. (xxxx),

Suhron, Yusuf, Subarniati, et al. (2020);

should be

Suhron, et al. (2020);

If you have more than one

Suhron, et al. (2020);

With all the same authors, then you can use

Suhron, et al. (2020a)

Suhron, et al. (2020b)

If you have more than one

Suhron, et al. (2020);

But different second authors, then you can include the second author in the citation to distinguish them, e.g. you have

Suhron, M., Yusuf, A. H., Subarniati, R., Amir, F., & Zainiyah, Z. (2020).

And

Suhron, M., Subarniati, R., Amir, F., & Zainiyah, Z. (2020).

Then you can use

Suhron, Yusuf, et al. (2020)

And

Suhron, Subarniati, et al. (2020).

To distinguish them.

Then, you can include the first letter of the first author to distinguish them.

* Decision One of the principal's most essential roles as a supervisor is to help teachers perform better by planning, executing, assessing, and following up on the outcomes of decision academic supervision by Mustafid, and Khairuddin (2016).

Should be

Decision One of the principal's most essential roles as a supervisor is to help teachers perform better by planning, executing, assessing, and following up on the outcomes of decision academic supervision by **Mustafid and Khairuddin (2016)**.

The discussion environment must be conducive for the instructor so that he or she is not overburdened by the outcomes of the discussion in Siburian, and Wau, (2018). Teachers must view discussion forums as a resource for finding answers by Brinia, et al., (2014).

should be

The discussion environment must be conducive for the instructor so that he or she is not overburdened by the outcomes of the discussion in Siburian and Wau (2018). Teachers must view discussion forums as a resource for finding answers by Brinia, et al. (2014).

Cui, et al. also verifies this conclusion

should be

Cui, et al. (xxxx) also verify this conclusion

The study shows that brand communication methods such as advertising/promotion and SNS have statistically significant negative effects on brand trust in the catering industry (Cui, Mou, Cohen, Liu, & Kurcz, 2020) .

should be

The study shows that brand communication methods such as advertising/promotion and SNS have statistically significant negative effects on brand trust in the catering industry (Cui, Mou, Cohen, Liu, & Kurcz, 2020).

Or

The study shows that brand communication methods such as advertising/promotion and SNS have statistically significant negative effects on brand trust in the catering industry (Cui, et al., 2020).

(Bajagai, et al. 2019).

should be

(Bajagai, et al., 2019).

If a person's morals are upset, they will feel stress and poor performance in real-world settings by Suhron, et al. (2020); Yusuf, et al. (2019).

Should be

If a person's morals are upset, they will feel stress and poor performance in real-world settings (Suhron, et al., 2020; Yusuf, et al., 2019).

Usman and Alam, (2020)

should be

Usman and Alam (2020)

(Abdullatif, et al., 2018; Ali, et al., 2022).

we can use, say (F. Abdullatif, et al., 2018)

only if there are 2 papers of (Abdullatif, et al., 2018)

but different “Abdullatif” and one is (F. Abdullatif, et al., 2018)

and, of course, we can use (F. A. Abdullatif, et al., 2018)

only if there are 2 papers of (F. Abdullatif, et al., 2018)

but different “F. Abdullatif” and one is (F. A. Abdullatif, et al., 2018)

I check the references, the paper has

- a) Abdullatif, A. A., Abdullatif, F. A., & Naji, S. A. (2019). An enhanced hybrid image encryption algorithm using Rubik's cube and dynamic DNA encoding techniques. *Periodicals of Engineering and Natural Sciences*, 7(4), 1607-1617.
- b) Abdullatif, F. A., Abdullatif, A. A., & al-Saffar, A. (2018). Hiding techniques for dynamic encryption text based on corner point. Paper presented at the *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*.

for (a), the authors can use Abdullatif et al., (2019).

for (b), the authors can use Abdullatif et al., (2018).

Tan, Zhang et al. (2021) and Tan et al. (2022)

should be Tan, et al. (2021, 2022)

we can use, say Tan, Zhang, et al. (2021)

only if there are 2 different papers of Tan, Zhang, et al. (2021)

and same “Tan” and one is Tan, Zhang, et al. (2021) and another one is not.

the citations have problems, e.g.

(J. Tan et al., 2022; J. Tan, X. Zhang et al., 2021; Z. Tan & Yan, 2021),

while in the references, they have

- 1) Tan, J., Chan, K. C., & Chen, Y. (2022). The impact of air pollution on the cost of debt financing: Evidence from the bond market. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 31(1), 464-482. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2904>
- 2) Tan, J., Tan, Z., & Chan, K. C. (2021). Does air pollution affect a firm's cash holdings? *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*, 67. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pacfin.2021.101549>
- 3) Tan, J., Zhang, X., Zhang, P., & Chan, K. C. (2021). Does air pollution matter in a supplier's trade credit strategy? Evidence from an emerging market. *Borsa Istanbul Review*, 21, 70-79. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bir.2021.03.008>
- 4) Tan, Z., & Yan, L. (2021). Does air pollution impede corporate innovation? *International Review of Economics and Finance*, 76, 937-951. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iref.2021.07.015>

for (4), they can use Tan & Yan (2021) or Tan and Yan (2021) or (Tan & Yan, 2021) or (Tan and Yan, 2021)

so that it is different from all others. no need to use (Z. Tan & Yan, 2021)

for (1), authors can use “Tan, et al. (2022)” or “Tan, Chan, & Chen (2022)” or “(Tan, et al., 2022)” or “Tan, Chan, & Chen, 2022)”

so that it is different from all others. no need to use (J. Tan et al., 2022)

the authors use “J. Tan, X. Zhang et al., 2021”, this is definitely no good. I have never seen any paper using this

The only problem is to distinguish 2 and 3.

to distinguish 2 and 3, it is very easy. the authors can use

“Tan, Tan, & Chan (2021)” or “Tan, Chan, & Chan (2021)” for (2) and use

“Tan, et al. (2021)” for 4

in case (2) has more than 3 authors, say, e.g.

5) Tan, J., Tan, Z., Chan, K. C. & Chen, Y. (2021). Does air pollution affect a firm's cash holdings? *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*, 67. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pacfin.2021.101549>

then the authors can use “Tan, Tan, et al. (2021)” or “(Tan, Tan, et al., 2021)” for (5) (but cannot use this for (2) because “et al.” means that there is more than one author after “Tan, Tan”.) and use “Tan, Zhang, et al. (2021)” or “(Tan, Zhang, et al., 2021)”for (3)

the citations have problems, e.g.

Tan, et al. (2021a) and Tan, et al. (2022)

should be

Tan, et al. (2021a, 2022)

the citations have problems, e.g.

(W. K. 2023)

Is wrong

(Gohar, et al., 2023; Jung, et al., 2018; Imane et al. 2023).

Should be

(Gohar, et al., 2023; Jung, et al., 2018; Imane, et al. 2023).

Rjoub et al. (2021) delved

Should be

Rjoub, et al. (2021) delved

Silvia (2018), concluded that the production of agricultural commodities is influenced by factors such as land, plant number, capital, fertilizers, medicines, labor, and experience.

should be

Silvia (2018) concluded that the production of agricultural commodities is influenced by factors such as land, plant number, capital, fertilizers, medicines, labor, and experience.

Research by Sutardi et al., (2022), shows the technical effectiveness of shallot farming in sandy Loam Soil in Tegalrejo, Gunungkidul, Indonesia.

should be

Research by [Sutardi, et al. \(2022\)](#) shows the technical effectiveness of shallot farming in sandy Loam Soil in Tegalrejo, Gunungkidul, Indonesia.
