



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_22835
Title of the Manuscript:	The differences among the levels of emigrants Jordanian tourists satisfaction in Arabian Gulf countries on the strategies of tourism marketing in Jordan due to demographic features
Type of the 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:

(<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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The data provided in the article are interesting. I appreciate the effort made by the authors. The weaknesses are numerous and very important. Some of the most important are: 1. The abstract is not correct. Rewrite. 2. The introduction has no theoretical analysis or references. Rewrite 3. Page 3: two questions, and the authors write only one. I don't understand. 4. The hypotheses are badly written. They seem objectives. Rewrite 5. Epigraphs 5 and 6 are very simple. They are not appropriate for a scientific article. Rewrite. 6. Epigraph 8 (operational definitions) is not required in a scientific paper. 7. Epigraph 9 (Literature Review). It is not appropriate for a scientific article. Rewrite. 8. Epigraph 10 (Data analysis): many tables and very little analysis. This format is not correct. 9. There is no conclusions section. This is essential. 10. Very insufficient scientific literature	1. We re-evaluated the abstract of our study, but we found it suitable with objectives of the study. 2. We developed the introduction with some few literature and new references. 3. We corrected the mistake that showed at the page 3. 4. We replaced the questions of the study instead of the hypothesis as long as our paper used to answer on the questions of the study. 5. We developed the Epigraphs 5,6,8,9 and the literature. 6. According to Epigraphs 10 (data analysis) , are satisfied about all the offered data and the way of the analysis and discussions as long as the research papers must be briefly because it is a paper not newspaper or a book. 7. We added a section for the conclusions upon the request of the reviewer. 8. We developed the scientific literature and we added new related studies. Note: The edited comments are highlighted with yellow colour.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Finally, we appreciate the efforts of the reviewers for all their comments that we are sure that will enrich our manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		