

## Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_125435
Title of the Manuscript:	Satisfaction of foreign and domestic tourists in the agritourism destinations of Kerala
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><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The article does present new data specific to agritourism in Kerala. To enhance its contribution to the industry, the article could explore more innovative solutions or provide a deeper analysis of what distinguishes Kerala's agritourism from other regions. The article is publishable, but it needs revisions to sharpen its focus, streamline its findings, and clarify its unique contributions to the field.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The current title, "Satisfaction of Foreign and Domestic Tourists in the Agritourism Destinations of Kerala," is informative and gives a clear idea of the focus of the article. However, it could be refined for better clarity and impact as below:            1) Evaluating Tourist Satisfaction in Kerala's Agritourism: A Comparative Study of Foreign and Domestic Visitors.            2) Tourist Satisfaction in Kerala Agritourism: Insights from Domestic and International Visitors            3) Exploring Satisfaction Levels in Kerala's Agritourism: Accessibility and Service Challenges for Domestic and Foreign Tourists.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract provides a concise overview of the study, focusing on the aims, methodology, and results. However, it could benefit from clearer structuring. The objective should be more distinct, and the findings could be more succinctly stated. The term "low satisfaction" is used repeatedly, but a clearer description of the specific dissatisfaction points and their relevance to agritourism could improve clarity. Overall, the abstract is informative but could be refined to enhance readability and focus.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>The overall structure of the manuscript follows a standard research article format, but there are areas where the subsections and their organization could be improved for clarity and coherence. Here's a detailed look at the subsections and structure:</b></p> <p><b>1. Abstract</b>            The abstract is concise but lacks distinct subsections like "Objective," "Methodology," "Results," and "Conclusion." Explicitly separating these would improve readability. The current format is a bit too narrative, and it would benefit from clearer sections to make the key points stand out.</p> <p><b>2. Introduction</b>            The introduction is well-written and informative, but it feels quite long and could benefit from being split into smaller subsections. Introducing a separate Background subsection or breaking it down into parts like Global Tourism Context and Kerala Agritourism Overview would help readers digest the content better. Additionally, the introduction blends some background information, which could be shifted into a distinct Literature Review section (if included).</p> <p><b>3. Literature Review</b>            The article does not have a clear literature review section. This is a significant omission in academic writing. A separate Literature Review section is essential to discuss past studies related to tourist satisfaction, agritourism trends, and relevant methodologies. Including this would contextualize the study and highlight gaps that the current research aims to fill.</p> <p><b>4. Methodology</b>            The methodology is well-structured but could be further divided into subsections such as:            Data Collection (detailing the primary and secondary data collection methods)            Sample Size and Selection            Tools for Data Analysis (explaining the Index Method and Mann-Whitney U test more clearly)            This would make it easier for readers to follow the research process step-by-step.</p> <p><b>5. Results and Discussion</b>            The results section is quite detailed, but the discussion is somewhat merged with it. For better clarity and flow, consider splitting this into two distinct sections:</p>	

## Review Form 3

	<p>Results: Focus solely on reporting findings without interpretation.</p> <p>Discussion: Interpret the results and link them to the existing literature, highlighting their significance and implications. This separation will make it easier for readers to understand the findings and their relevance without <b>getting lost in the data analysis.</b></p> <p><b>6. Conclusion</b> The conclusion provides a good summary but could include its own subsections for: <b>Key Findings</b> Implications for Practice (recommendations for policymakers and agritourism operators) Future Research Directions (suggesting areas for further exploration) This would add more structure to the concluding remarks and make it clearer how the study contributes to the field and what steps should be taken moving forward.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>The introduction is well-detailed, offering a broad overview of tourism, its economic impact, and the role of agritourism in Kerala. However, the flow could be more focused, especially in linking the global perspective of tourism with the local context of Kerala agritourism. The statistics provided are relevant, but they could be integrated more smoothly to avoid the impression of listing facts without analysis. The connection between agritourism and its economic potential for Kerala could be emphasized earlier in the introduction.</p> <p><b>Literature Review</b></p> <p>There appears to be a lack of a dedicated section for the literature review, which is typically an essential part of a research article. Integrating relevant previous studies into the introduction or creating a separate literature review would strengthen the academic depth. The article would benefit from a more detailed review of the existing research on tourist satisfaction, agritourism, and the factors influencing the success of agritourism destinations.</p> <p><b>Methodology</b></p> <p>The methodology section is clear and straightforward, using a primary survey with a well-sized sample of domestic and foreign tourists. However, the description of the data collection process could be expanded. For example, it would be helpful to include more details about the design of the structured questionnaire and the sampling method. The use of both the index method and Mann-Whitney U test is appropriate, but the explanations for these methods could be simplified for better comprehension by a broader audience.</p> <p><b>Results and Discussion</b></p> <p>The results section is comprehensive and explains the findings well. The comparison between domestic and foreign tourists' satisfaction is effectively presented, but the discussion of the results is somewhat repetitive. The emphasis on accessibility, telecommunication, and medical facilities is strong, but the implications of these findings could be explored further. How do these issues compare to similar agritourism centers in other regions or countries? Adding such a comparison would deepen the analysis. Moreover, including more figures or charts might enhance the presentation of the data.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>The conclusion is a well-rounded summary of the study's findings. It reiterates the importance of visitor satisfaction and the need for improvement in infrastructure and services. However, it could be strengthened by more clearly stating the contributions of the study to the field of agritourism. Are there specific recommendations for policymakers or agritourism operators? Explicitly outlining these in the conclusion would add practical value.</p>	

## Review Form 3

<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -	The reference section seems well-formed, but it's always important to ensure that the references are recent and relevant. You might also consider having a subsection for Key Studies Referenced, summarizing the main literature that the study builds upon.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>With revisions, particularly in improving the clarity and flow of the abstract, introduction, and results discussion, the article has the potential to be published. The methodology and data are sound, but deeper engagement with the literature and more focused recommendations would elevate the quality further.</p> <p>The structure is logical and mostly follows academic standards, but the manuscript would benefit from better organization and clearer subsections, especially in the Introduction, Methodology, and Results sections. Adding a Literature Review section and separating the Discussion from the Results would also greatly enhance the manuscript's clarity and adherence to academic conventions.</p> <p>By making these structural adjustments, the article would be easier to read, more logically organized, and more in line with scholarly standards for publication.</p>	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Suhaila Binti Nadzri</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universiti Islam Selangor, Malaysia</b>