

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_90428
Title of the Manuscript:	Promoting WOM through Destination Image in the Era of Live-Streaming in Health and Wellness Tourism Context
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The researcher used the (Mediation) effect and did not use the (Moderation) role</p> <p>Title page: The researcher must include the study period in the title.</p> <p>Abstract: Abstract should be formulated according to the methodology recognized in the journal. An abstract briefly explains the salient aspects of the content. Abstracts should be accurate and succinct, self-contained, and readable. The abstract should paraphrase and summarise rather than quote from the paper. Abstracts should relate only to the paper to be presented/assessed.</p> <p>Keywords: Keywords not Keywords. Keywords should be chosen carefully and in accordance with the research methodology. It should not be less than 5 words according to the publication regulations in the journal. include 4-8 keywords and cite between 2-4 references.</p> <p>Model Specification: Why didn't the researcher use the latest version of AMOS22? why</p> <p>Introduction: You need an increase, it is very little.</p> <p>Method:</p> <p>Research framework: It needs a deeper explanation and explanation, as it is not clear</p> <p>Measuring tools: It needs a deeper explanation and explanation, as it is not clear</p> <p>Result: Response data (questionnaire) was not examined. The results of validity and reliability of the (questionnaire). Cronbach's alpha.</p> <p>Table1: It is noticed from the results of the descriptive examination that there is instability in the answers of the respondents.</p> <p>TABLE 6. Results of SEM: The value of the coefficient of determination (R^2) is small but acceptable.</p> <p>Table 7 Results of Mediated analysis (Bootstrap method): R^2_{WO} .557 The value of the coefficient of determination (R^2) is small but acceptable.</p> <p>Discussion: It is very simple and It must be linked to the findings of the researcher. with interpretation and discussion</p> <p>Conclusion and Recommendation: It is very simple and It must be linked to the findings of the researcher. with interpretation and discussion</p> <p>References: By adding paragraphs in the introduction and methodology and increasing references and sources The most modern and most read References must be current and impactful. 2015-2021 They must be arranged in alphabetical order.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hassan Tawakol Ahmed Fadol
Department, University & Country	Sudan University of Science and Technology, Sudan