

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_126495
Title of the Manuscript:	Will Machines Replace Humans in the Hospitality Business?
Type of the Article	Literature Review

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript presents a literature review on AI and robotics in the hospitality industry. While comprehensive literature reviews can offer valuable overviews of current academic discourse, especially for scholars seeking to understand the field's trajectory, there are justified reservations regarding their standalone value for publication in academic journals. As emphasized in empirical research textbooks, the strength of empirical studies often lies in their ability to contribute new findings to the field. Literature reviews, while informative, typically summarize existing knowledge without advancing it through novel data collection or analysis. Nonetheless, this review can serve as a useful resource for academics interested in exploring trends, theoretical perspectives, and technological impacts within the hospitality industry, laying a foundation for future empirical studies in this rapidly evolving field.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Will Machines Replace Humans in the Hospitality Business?" is engaging but may not accurately capture the study's specific focus on the review of literature covering the extent of AI and robotics adoption and its impact on human roles. Keywords: Keywords like "Hospitality Industry," "Artificial Intelligence," "Robotics," and "Guest experience" are relevant but could be expanded to include terms like "Automation" and "Human Touch" to better reflect the study's themes.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Abstract: The abstract provides an overview of the purpose, methodology, and findings, but lacks a clearly articulated main objective. The findings are mentioned briefly without sufficient detail on how they lead to the stated conclusions.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, progressing logically from the introduction and literature review to methodology, findings, and conclusions. However, certain sections, particularly the literature review, could benefit from clearer thematic organization to improve readability. Grouping related studies under subheadings like "Operational Efficiency," "Guest Satisfaction," and "Job Displacement" would help the reader follow the analysis more effectively. Additionally, the findings section could be more structured, with subsections that directly link the literature reviewed to the study's conclusions.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The scientific correctness of this manuscript has several areas needing improvement to meet standards of robustness and technical soundness. While it offers a timely overview of AI and robotics in hospitality, there are fundamental weaknesses in the literature review and methodology that affect its scientific rigor.</p> <p>Firstly, while the databases used for sourcing literature are mentioned (e.g., EBSCO, Google Scholar, Scopus), the methodology lacks detail regarding selection criteria, article inclusion processes, and methods for synthesizing findings, all of which are necessary for transparency and replicability. A more rigorous methodology would specify not only the databases but also the keywords, timeframes, and specific criteria that guided the selection and analysis of literature. Without these details, the study's foundation is less scientifically robust, as readers cannot ascertain the thoroughness of the literature review process.</p> <p>Additionally, a major gap in the manuscript is its lack of quantitative data from the reviewed articles. Empirical studies in the literature often provide valuable statistics on AI's impacts, which can be used to substantiate claims. For instance, the manuscript states, "The research indicates that while technology and machines have improved operational efficiency and reduced costs, the human touch remains crucial," yet does not cite statistical evidence from studies that quantify this improvement in efficiency or cost reduction. Including specific data, such as reported percentages or satisfaction scores, would lend empirical weight to these statements, making the conclusions more credible and technically sound.</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>The findings section similarly presents broad statements that would be strengthened by data-driven insights. For example, phrases like “Most hoteliers agree that AI provides consistency and speed but lacks personalization” would be vastly improved with quantifiable survey data from the reviewed studies. The omission of these statistics leaves the findings section underdeveloped, as the reader is given little concrete evidence to assess the claims made.</p> <p>In summary, while the manuscript addresses a pertinent issue and provides a broad overview, its scientific soundness is compromised by the lack of methodological detail and the absence of statistical evidence from the reviewed literature. Addressing these gaps would make the study more scientifically rigorous and substantiate its conclusions with empirical data.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The references in this manuscript are generally adequate and cover relevant studies on AI and robotics in hospitality. However, there are a few instances where older sources are cited (e.g., Achacoso, 1990), which could be replaced or supplemented with more recent publications to reflect the latest advancements in AI and robotics post-COVID-19, a period that has accelerated technological adoption in hospitality. Updating these sources will strengthen the manuscript's relevance and timeliness.</p> <p>Additionally, there are formatting inconsistencies in the in-text citations. For instance, some in-text citations include author initials, which is not consistent with the standard referencing style. I recommend a thorough review to ensure all in-text citations are properly formatted and that each cited reference appears in the reference list. Conversely, all items in the reference list should be checked to confirm they are cited within the text. These inconsistencies, if left uncorrected, could undermine the manuscript's credibility.</p> <p>Ensuring citation uniformity and completeness will enhance the manuscript's professionalism and adherence to academic standards.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript has several grammatical errors and inconsistencies in language style. Improving sentence structure, clarity, and flow, especially in the findings section, would enhance readability. Additionally, some terminology lacks precision, which can be addressed by using consistent language throughout. I suggest that the manuscript should be subjected to a language software (Grammarly) review. Please replace the word "exterminate" as the use of AI cannot exterminate humans.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Methodology Section Current Status: The methodology states that the study uses a narrative synthesis without detailing the specific selection and analysis procedures. Suggested Addition: Clearly outline data sources, selection criteria, and analysis techniques. For example: "Studies were selected based on relevance to AI in hospitality and included peer-reviewed articles from 1990-2023 across Scopus, Google Scholar, and Web of Science databases. Data were thematically analyzed to extract insights on technological impacts on guest experience and operational efficiency." Key Findings and Analysis Current Status: Key findings mention general observations on AI in hospitality but lack quantitative backing or comparative statements. Suggested Enhancement: Strengthen findings with quantitative data from cited studies, where available. For example: "According to [Author, Year], AI integration reduced operational costs by X% while improving guest satisfaction scores by Y%, indicating a balanced benefit when combined with human interaction." Conclusion and Recommendation Current Status: The conclusion offers practical recommendations but is generic. Suggested Improvement: Relate conclusions to study findings, emphasizing a nuanced balance between AI benefits and human-centric service. An example addition: "Future implementations of AI should focus on augmenting rather than replacing human roles to preserve the personalized guest experience that remains integral to hospitality success."</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Joseph Robert Roberson</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa</p>