

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_86056
Title of the Manuscript:	DIGITAL BEHAVIOUR IN GASTRONOMY TOURISM: MILLENNIAL TOURIST AND THEIR CONSUMPTION PATTERN
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The study lacks academic writing.</p> <p>The language of the study is weak. It needs proofreading by English native speaker.</p> <p>Some references in the introduction and literature review are old. Please replace them.</p> <p>The title is not well structured. It would be better to change it to be "DIGITAL BEHAVIOUR IN GASTRONOMY TOURISM: THE CONSUMPTION PATTERNS OF THE MILLENNIAL TOURISTS".</p> <p>In the abstract author(s) mentioned "This study aims to see the consumption behaviour". The word "see" is not the right word to explain the aim of the study. It is not commonly used in research methods.</p> <p>This study aimed to analyse tourist behaviour related to digital media in gastronomic tours. A fundamental question is what is the underlying theory(s) supporting this study?</p> <p>Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?</p> <p>The methodology is weak and shallow. It lacks details about the research design, measurement scale, questionnaire design, data collection and data analysis.</p> <p>In the methodology, author(s) mentioned "a questionnaire that includes questions related to demographics, pre-travel behavior (indicators in determining culinary choices at destinations, information seeking behavior, digital media information referrals, and social media factors on purchasing decisions), on-travel behavior (booking method and on-site experience sharing behavior), as well as post-travel behavior (repurchase interest and eating experience sharing behavior to social media)." Big question arises here. What are the references that author(s) referred to when they wrote the questions of the questionnaire? Author(s) must clarify the sources of these questions. Are these questions refereed, tested, and adopted by previous researchers? How the author(s) knew that these questions are the right ones that can help achieving the objectives of the study?</p> <p>Results. In the tables 3, 10 and 11, author(s) merged the measurement scales of the questionnaire together. For example, in table 3, you merged "Agree, Strongly Agree and Quite Agree" together, and you merged "Disagree and Strongly Disagree". How come you did that? It does not make sense. Thus, your results are completely wrong.</p> <p>The conclusion was a very short recap of the results section with no meaningful insights. It needs improvement.</p> <p>Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?</p> <p>Please, highlight the limitations of study and future research.</p> <p>Many citation mistakes in the references list.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Saad Al-Saad
Department, University & Country	Yarmouk University, Jordan