

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Global Economics, Management and Business Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEMBR_12659
Title of the Manuscript:	Examining Tourists' Intention To Visit Karimunjawa National Park: The Role of Social Media
Type of the Article	Sustainable and Responsible Tourism under Case Study Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The study is very important because it addresses the following SDG goals: SDG 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth; SDG 12: Responsible Consumption and Production; SDG 14: Life Below Water; SDG 17: Partnerships for the achievement of the Goals</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>I suggest that the title be changed to: Empirical Study of Tourists' Intention to Visit Karimunjawa National Park: The Role of Social Media</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>I suggest that in the first line of the Abstract, the wrongly spelt word "Desember" be changed to "December".</p> <p>I suggest that the word "marine" to be added as an adjective to "Karimunjawa National Park", in the third line to read like this: "marine Karimunjawa National Park",</p> <p>That in line six, the expression "selected through the purposive sampling method" be corrected to "selected through the purposive sampling technique".</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The use of "IMRAD" approach by the study adds heavy weight to the scientific correctness of the article – Introduction, Methods, Analysis, Discussion and Conclusion.</p> <p>The study also addresses three SDG goals as named above. This observation in the Study among others is worthy of note: <i>From a theoretical perspective, this study makes a significant contribution to the tourism marketing literature by exploring the intersection of social media influence and environmental sustainability challenges.</i></p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References are very sufficient and recent.</p>	

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the article is suitable for scholarly communications, precise and understandable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The following minor corrections should be made: Under 2.6 Destination Image and Visit Intention, “Based on the findings from prior research initiatives, this study proposes the following hypotheses for empirical testing”: the highlighted word should change to “hypothesis”. This is because it is only one of the many hypotheses proposed. Correct the same mistake under 2.8 Destination Awareness and Visit Intention Correct the same mistake under 2.10 Destination Trust and Visit Intention</p> <p>Under 4.1 Participants: in the third line, “A purposive sampling method was employed”, change the highlighted word to “technique”.</p> <p>For Table 2. Profile of Partisipants: Profile of “Partisipants”, change the wrongly spelt highlighted word to “participants” In the same Table 2, change the wrongly spelt “martial status” to “marital status”; Change wrongly spelt “Deceased Partenr” to “Deceased Partner”.</p> <p>Under 3.1. Measures: “<i>The following figure illustrates the theoretical framework in this study, which are measured through indicators derived from previous research in the fields of marketing and tourism</i>”. It should read like this, “<i>The following figure, Figure 2</i>”. In research, in referring to Tables, Figures, Plates etc, we always mention the Table, Figure number as well in the discussion or explanantion.</p> <p>Under 4.2 Validity and Reliability Test; <i>Finally, the visit intention construct retains three indicators with a high level of reliability, marked by an alpha value of 0.785. All retained indicators show strong validity in measuring the observed variables. Furthermore, all constructs exhibit alpha scores above 0.8, indicating a high level of reliability in measuring these variables.</i> The alpha value of 0.785 for visit intention is less than alpha score of 0.8 so the word “all” should change to “almost all”.</p> <p>Under 4.3 Hypotheses Test: the first senetence about Figure 2 is too narrow. This is too short for expalantion for Figure 2.</p>	

	<p>Under 5. Discussion: in the 4th paragraph: For the 4th Hypothesis, as indicated in Table 4, the CR value should be 4.005 and not 2.454 as wrongly indicated in the paragraph.</p> <p>Under 5 Discussion: in the 5th paragraph; As indicated in Table 4, for H5, the CR value is 2.484 but in the disuccion (5th paragraph) it is stated as 2.480. Re-check and correct this mistake.</p> <p>Under 7. Implication, the third paragraph, the first word should be "Moreover" and not "More over"</p>	
--	---	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nicholas Imbeah
Department, University & Country	Takoradi Technical University, Ghana