

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_112126
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Attributes of Haryanvi Festival Food on Tourist Attraction
Type of the Article	

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>The current study was conducted to determine the relationship between tourist demographics and their perceptions of Haryavi festival food. In this regard, this study further attempts to understand the key attributes of Haryana festival food items that influence visitors' perception of Haryana festival food as a tourist attraction. The findings showed that among the demographics of visitors, age was the only factor that positively correlated with visitors' perceptions of Haryavi festival food.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript has already pointed to age as an important relevant factor in the show's food tourism and has important implications for the scientific community. 2. The title of the article is basically appropriate. 3. The abstract should specify the research motivation, research purpose, research methods, and research findings. Therefore, it is suggested that the author readjust the content of the abstract. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are basically suitable, and it is suggested to add discussion and suggestion sections to explain the correlation between the analysis results and the literature. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. Furthermore, the study should provide recommendations for future research. In addition, references should be added newer. 	
<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/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Tsai-Fa Yen
Department, University & Country	Fujian Agriculture and Forestry University, China