

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_86140
Title of the Manuscript:	Better ways for the Integration of Educational Tourism and Rural Revitalization at Guilin Village, China
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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Article abstract is incomplete. Because it does not express the methodology of the work and its findings and results. Also, the statement of the main issue in this research is not clearly introduced and there is no statistical evidence about the importance and necessity of conducting research. Unfortunately, this article lacks theoretical gap analysis in the section on theoretical foundations and thematic backgrounds of research, especially on educational tourism and rural revitalization, and no comparison has been made between the present work and the research presented. And for this reason, the researcher has not been able to explain the innovation of the present work in a scientific and practical way.</p> <p>In addition, the theoretical framework of the research and its conceptual model are not clear and no theoretical support has been provided for the main research problem in scientific language.</p>	Revised
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>The article lacks purpose in both scientific and applied sections and there is no exact alignment between problem statement, research questions, research objectives and possible hypotheses.</p> <p>The method of doing the work is not well explained and the level of analysis in this research is not clear.</p> <p>Necessary reviews should be made about the introduction of the community and the statistical sample, as well as the type of research method and data collection method.</p> <p>Regarding the validity and reliability of measuring instruments, no significant information is observed.</p>	Noted
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The summary of the results is incomplete and the present work lacks practical suggestions for research mining. Also, there is no discussion about the results and findings of the study compared to other similar studies. The generalizability of the results to other areas of the study province is not clear and the limitations of the work have not been introduced by the researcher or researchers.</p> <p>No suggestions have been made for further research due to the limitations of this work.</p> <p>The reference method must be reviewed and revised according to the journal instructions.</p> <p>The protocol of the interviews conducted in the study village is not clear and no evidence has been provided about the variables and their measurement structures.</p>	Noted

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	