



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This is a potentially interesting paper that needs some more work. First, the paper will need to be edited at some stage for language use, since the paper is quite difficult to understand at times. Second, the literature review is very narrow and would benefit from a wider range of sources, specifically with respect to the issue of expatriate citizens returning to their own countries for holidays. The methodology section should be strengthened: how was the questionnaire developed and tested? What language was used in the research? How, in detail, were questionnaires distributed and returned? What is the meaning of 'snowball' sampling in this context? What about validity – was Cronbach's alpha calculated? What about the possibility of non-response bias? Next, the findings section contains many lengthy tables – too lengthy; the authors should find a way to present the material using less space. The discussion section is very brief and does not give many details about the meaning of the hypothesis tests. Consequently, it is difficult to identify what is the contribution to knowledge that the paper makes. The limitations to the research should also be mentioned. Finally, some of the suggestions and recommendations are not justified by the research presented and should be reconsidered.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	School of Management, Shinawatra University, Thailand