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|  | |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer** | | | **review.** |  |   **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **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.** | This manuscript provides valuable insight into the differentiated preferences and behavioral intentions of tourists from ethnic minority groups versus Han-majority visitors in the context of tourism marketing. It contributes to a relatively under-explored intersection between tourism behavior and ethnic diversity, especially within regional Chinese destinations.    By offering an empirical approach using robust statistical techniques, the study advances practical knowledge for targeted destination management and ethnic-sensitive marketing strategies. These findings have broad relevance not only in tourism and marketing research but also in social science discussions around cultural diversity, economic development, and inclusion in service design. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Yes, the title is relevant and informative. It clearly reflects the geographical focus, research topic, and empirical nature of the study. |  |
| **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.** | Partially. The abstract includes the background, objectives, methodology, and results. However, some improvements are recommended:    The structure is cluttered. The numbering of objectives (1), (2), (3) disrupts the narrative flow.  The methodology (sample size and techniques used) is briefly mentioned but should clearly state the analytical methods (e.g., “independent sample t-tests, ANOVA, and regression analysis”) in a cleaner sentence.    The conclusion should be more impactful. Mentioning implications for theory and practice would enhance scholarly significance. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | Yes, overall it demonstrates methodological rigor. Strengths include:    Use of validated constructs and reliability testing (Cronbach’s alpha > 0.78)  Clear structural model, use of VIF to check multicollinearity, and appropriate segmentation analysis    However, a few issues need attention:   * Sampling Bias: The sample has a large student population (44.6%), which may skew generalizability. This limitation should be acknowledged. * Terminology Inconsistency: The term "Han minority" is used incorrectly in tables — it should be "Han majority" or simply "Han respondents." * Regression Tables: Tables 4 and 5 are mismatched in labeling the dependent variables; this needs correction to reflect actual outcomes (satisfaction vs. intention). |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | I recommend this paper, regarding dynamic capabilities in education:    Achmad, F., & Wiratmadja, I. I. (2024). Driving sustainable performance in SMEs through frugal innovation: the nexus of sustainable leadership, knowledge management, and dynamic capabilities. IEEE Access. DOI:  10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3433474 |  |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | Needs improvement. The manuscript is understandable but contains many grammatical flaws, awkward phrasing, and inconsistent verb tenses.    Examples needing revision:    “The scenic area image plays a significant role…” → “The image of a scenic area plays a significant role…” Repetition such as "XX has a beautiful view" (in table items) should be replaced with actual references or scenic spot names. |  |
| **Optional/General** comments | **Language and Grammar**  There are numerous grammatical, structural, and syntactic issues throughout the manuscript. The academic tone fluctuates; some sections read like reports rather than scholarly analysis.    **Abstract and Structure:**  The abstract lacks clarity and balance. A clearer summary of methods, findings, and implications is needed. Introduction should better connect the research gap to existing literature internationally.    **Over-reliance on Local Sources:**  The manuscript leans heavily on Chinese sources (especially Yan Caifa), which narrows its global relevance.  Needs broader international theories or frameworks for positioning, cultural behavior, and tourism (e.g., Hofstede, Pine & Gilmore, Cohen).    **Terminology Inconsistencies:**  The phrase "Han minority" is a contradiction — should be "Han majority" or simply "Han."  Some survey items and constructs use “XX” instead of actual place names, making interpretation unclear.    **Discussion and Theoretical Contributions:**  While the data analysis is strong, theoretical contribution is underdeveloped. The paper should clarify how it advances positioning theory or ethnic consumer behavior. | Noted and revised |
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