

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_107976
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Affecting Customer Satisfaction with rural Tourism Services in Vietnam: A Comprehensive Study
Type of the Article	Case study

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>I have finished reading the article, and overall, the quality is quite low with several non-standard elements. However, as the journal's policy does not allow rejection based on "lack of novelty," I will provide some suggestions to help the authors improve their paper. Below, I will point out areas for improvement in each section of the article.</p> <p>(1) Title: I believe the subtitle can be removed since the article content does not match the description of a "comprehensive study."</p> <p>(2) Abstract: The abstract needs rewriting. It does not adequately explain how the study was conducted using a case study approach. Additionally, the article does not seem to be a case study but rather a standard empirical analysis verifying a theoretical model?</p> <p>(3) Introduction: The introduction lacks logical flow. I suggest reorganizing it into three paragraphs: the first introducing the research background, the second discussing the shortcomings of previous research and how this study addresses them, and the third providing an overall overview of the study. I am also puzzled by a statement in the introduction: "However, there is a limited understanding of Vietnamese rural tourists and their loyalty intentions." Please explain this.</p> <p>(4) Hypotheses: Some sections in this part are repetitive, and some hypotheses are not well-explained. I suggest that the author reorganizes this part because many statements lack logical coherence. In section 2.2, the first paragraph needs to be rewritten for better readability. Moreover, I have some questions about the research model. For example, what is the difference between perceived quality and perceived value? Does perceived quality affect perceived value? These require further clarification.</p> <p>(5) Research Methods: The research methods lack rigor and have some evident flaws. The article mentions that participants include various ages, genders, nationalities, and travel preferences, but did the author conduct statistical analyses on these groups? What are the proportions of each group? In the section where scales are introduced, the author repeatedly uses Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) for validation, which is unnecessary. If established scales are used, reporting the Cronbach's alpha coefficient is sufficient. CFA is mainly used for discriminant validity testing and model fit evaluation. Most importantly, the article lacks a discussion of the common method bias issue, which needs to be addressed.</p> <p>(6) Discussion: In my experience, this section appears more like content generated by an AI tool, as it is not typical of academic writing. Please provide an explanation. Of course, I do not deny the important role of AI tools in assisting with paper writing, but authors should not use AI to generate content directly. This is a matter of respect for the reviewers.</p> <p>(7) References: The format is incorrect. Please study and use the correct journal citation format.</p> <p>In summary, there are many issues with this paper. I believe the authors are likely beginners in academic writing. While there may be a gap in academic proficiency, there is still plenty of room for improvement with the right attitude. However, I have noticed that the paper has many issues related to formatting, sentence structure, and spelling. I hope the authors take these points seriously and consider referencing already published journal articles for guidance during their revision process.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language quality still needs further improvement.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please carefully organize the article format and layout.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Biyang Wang
Department, University & Country	Institute of Public Administration, Lanzhou University of Finance and Economics, China