

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_126848
Title of the Manuscript:	The Promises and Challenges of Google Nest Hub Integration in Cilegon Hotels
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

[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 research is crucial for the scientific community as it not only highlights the potential benefits of using Google Nest Hub to enhance operational efficiency and guest satisfaction but also addresses the challenges that accompany such technological adoption. By employing qualitative methods, including interviews and observations, the study provides a comprehensive understanding of how these devices can transform hotel experiences while also identifying barriers to implementation, such as user resistance and technical issues. I appreciate this manuscript for its thorough exploration of a timely topic—smart technology in hospitality—especially in a region where such integration is still emerging. The use of the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) framework adds depth to the analysis, allowing for a nuanced examination of factors influencing technology adoption. However, I would suggest to include more quantitative data to complement the qualitative findings, which could strengthen the overall conclusions drawn from the study.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "The Promises and Challenges of Google Nest Hub Integration in Cilegon Hotels" accurately reflects the focus of the manuscript, which explores both the potential benefits and obstacles associated with implementing Google Nest Hub technology in hotels, specifically in Cilegon, Indonesia.</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>The abstract of the article provides a solid overview of the study's focus on the integration of Google Nest Hub in Cilegon hotels, highlighting both the potential benefits and challenges. However, it could be enhanced by including a few additional details to improve clarity and comprehensiveness.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify the Methodology: While the abstract mentions qualitative methods, it would benefit from specifying the number of participants or the types of interviews conducted. This would give readers a better understanding of the research scope. Highlight Key Findings: The abstract briefly mentions key findings but could elaborate on specific challenges and benefits identified. For example, detailing how guest satisfaction is measured or what particular operational efficiencies were observed would provide more insight. Include Implications: Adding a sentence about the implications of these findings for hotel management or future research could strengthen the abstract's relevance to the broader scientific community. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's structure and subsections are generally appropriate, effectively guiding the reader through the research's context, methodology, and findings. Here are some observations regarding its organization:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Sectioning: The manuscript is divided into logical sections such as Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, and Results and Discussion. This structure helps in systematically presenting the research and findings. Subsections: The use of subsections within the Literature Review and Results sections is beneficial. For instance, breaking down the literature review into specific topics like Industry 5.0, IoT, and UTAUT allows for a focused discussion on each aspect relevant to the study. Methodology Details: The Methodology section provides a clear explanation of the qualitative approach and sampling techniques used, which is essential for understanding how data was collected and analyzed. Results Presentation: The Results section effectively highlights key findings related to Google Nest Hub integration in the hotel. However, it could benefit from more explicit headings or bullet points to summarize findings for easier readability. <p>Suggestions for Improvement: Add a Conclusion Section: Including a distinct Conclusion section would help summarize the key takeaways from the study and reinforce its implications for the hospitality industry.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. Firstly, it employs a qualitative research methodology, which is appropriate for exploring the nuanced experiences and perceptions of hotel staff and guests regarding the integration of Google Nest Hub technology. This</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>approach allows for in-depth insights that quantitative methods may overlook, thereby enhancing the richness of the data collected through interviews and observations.</p> <p>Secondly, the manuscript utilizes the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) framework, which provides a well-established theoretical basis for understanding the factors influencing technology adoption. By applying this model, the research effectively contextualizes its findings within a broader theoretical landscape, demonstrating a strong alignment with existing literature on technology acceptance.</p> <p>Additionally, the study addresses both the promises and challenges associated with the implementation of smart technology in hospitality, offering a balanced perspective that is critical for practical applications in the industry. This dual focus not only contributes to academic discourse but also provides actionable insights for hotel management seeking to enhance guest experiences through technological integration.</p> <p>Overall, these elements collectively affirm the scientific correctness and technical soundness of the manuscript.</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 the manuscript appear to be a mix of recent and relevant sources, but there are areas for improvement in terms of sufficiency and recency. While the manuscript cites foundational literature on the Internet of Things (IoT) and the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), it could benefit from additional recent studies that specifically address the integration of smart technologies in hospitality settings.</p> <p>Suggestions for Additional References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Recent Studies on IoT in Hospitality: Including more recent articles or studies published within the last two years that focus on the impact of IoT technologies, especially in hospitality, would enhance the manuscript's relevance. For example, research that examines guest experiences with smart devices in hotels or case studies on specific implementations could provide valuable insights.2. Technological Adoption Frameworks: Including references to recent advancements or adaptations of technology acceptance models beyond UTAUT could offer a more comprehensive theoretical framework for understanding user acceptance of smart technologies.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the manuscript are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas that require improvement for clarity and professionalism.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity and Precision: While the manuscript conveys its ideas, some sentences are overly complex or awkwardly structured, which can hinder reader comprehension. For example, phrases such as "the integration itself, initially driven by the need for contactless solutions during the COVID-19 to prevent the transfers of virus" could be simplified and clarified to enhance readability. Grammar and Syntax: There are several grammatical errors and issues with punctuation throughout the text. For instance, inconsistent use of articles (e.g., "the Internet of Things" vs. "Internet of Things") and missing commas can distract from the overall professionalism of the writing. Technical Terminology: The manuscript appropriately employs technical terminology relevant to the field, such as "UTAUT model" and "qualitative methods." However, ensuring that these terms are consistently defined and used correctly throughout the text would strengthen its scholarly quality. Flow and Cohesion: The flow between sections can be improved. Some transitions between ideas feel abrupt, making it challenging for readers to follow the argumentation smoothly. Clearer topic sentences at the beginning of each section could help guide readers through the manuscript's structure. <p>In summary, while the manuscript is fundamentally suitable for scholarly communication, enhancing clarity, correcting grammatical issues, ensuring consistent terminology, and improving transitions would significantly elevate its quality and effectiveness in conveying research findings.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Based on the evaluation of the manuscript titled "The Promises and Challenges of Google Nest Hub Integration in Cilegon Hotels," I would assign an overall mark of 8. This indicates a need for minor revisio</p> <p>Just improve the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript contains several sections that present information and definitions, such as those regarding Industry 5.0 and the Internet of Things (IoT), without appropriate citations or references to the original authors. For instance, phrases explaining Industry 5.0 and IoT concepts are presented in a manner that suggests they are original content when they may not be. Certain sentences and phrases closely resemble existing literature on these topics without quotation marks or citations, which is a clear indication of plagiarism. For example, the description of the UTAUT model appears to be paraphrased but lacks citation to the original source. 	

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>Lea C Colbongan-Papay</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Baguio, Philippines</p>

Review Form 3