



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_43872
Title of the Manuscript:	The Profile and Behavior of “Digital Tourist” in making decisions and travelling Case Study: Generation Z in South of Jakarta
Type of the Article	original

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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 topic of your papers is interesting, but in order to be published still there are several aspects to be improved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What sampling method you used? When the research was conducted? Which was the structure of the questionnaires/interviews? How you selected the respondents? <p>All this aspects need to be mention in the methodology part.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Table 1. All the responders are married? This is quite surprisingly 3. For the respondents under 18 years old, did you get the acceptance of their parents/tutors to interview them? 4. I recommend you to add more tables/figures to the results part. It will much easier for the readers to fallow the paper. 5. In the results part I was expecting to find a dipper analysis. Are there any difference between male and female? For instance? I consider this kind of analysis comparing the <p>Results based on the gender, education level would increase the value of your paper. Please mention the limits of your study, future research direction</p> <p>Ehical issue- I am concern about the fact that the authors interview people under 18 years. Did they have the accept of their parents/tutors?</p>	<p>These comments were included in revised article.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sampling method revised 2. Married become single (missed typing) 3. Clearly explained 4. Added some charts 5. Commparation explanation revised <p>Ethical issue: we have been explained in the artcle that we receieved the permission from their parents. This statement mentioned in part</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		