

Paper: “Metaverse in Tourism and Hospitality: Empirical Evidence on Generation Z from Italy”

Submitted: 27 October 2022

Accepted: 29 November 2022

Published: 30 November 2022

Corresponding Author: Elisa Rancati

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n31p122](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n31p122)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Panagiota Xanthopoulou
Hellenic Open University, School of Humanities, Greece

Reviewer 3: Jazmín Lubina Avalos Arias
Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo, México

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer F:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

I consider the title gives the idea the article wants to transmit.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

I think the abstract could be a little more extensive and explain the methodology in the article is been used.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

I found very few grammar mistakes.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

I consider the article explains clearly the methodology the authors decided to use, and it explains the main points to get to the results.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

I consider the body is enough and it contains the information necessary to explain the methodology and the results they get to.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

I think the conclusion gives the main ideas of the text of the article, the methodology they used, and they let the door open to new investigations about this theme.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

I consider the references are enough.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer G:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

I think the title matches the content

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

In the summary part, it should be stated between which dates the data was collected, from whom and how many people the data were collected.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

I think the language used is good

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

In the sampling part, it should be stated which sampling method was used.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes. It is ok.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

I think the summary, content and conclusion support each other

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

It is adequate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

First of all, congratulations for the work you have done. I think it will contribute to the studies on technology in tourism. Congratulations.

Reviewer H:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The authors are off to a good start with an interesting title.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract has no flaws and presents the needed information.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The authors should revise the language to improve readability. While the study appears to be sound, the language is unclear, making it difficult to follow. I advise the authors to work with a writing coach or copy editor to improve the flow and readability of the text.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The technical details should be expanded and clarified to ensure that readers understand exactly what the researchers studied. Alternatively, the authors should include more information that clarifies and justifies their choice of methods.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

This has enough data points to make sure the data are reliable. The authors should also consider and explain whether there is any in-built bias not nullified by the control experiments.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is supported however there is a need to include a future directions and limitations section.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references used in this article are up to date.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer I:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

the abstract paragraph should be written in a single text without spaces between paragraphs. Also in this section we do not write in the future tense. It should be in the indefinite past tense and mention the importance of the research. The way the summary is worded is more like an introduction paragraph. In general the abstract section needs to be reworded from the ground up to state the key findings, the significance of the research and its practical application. The ABSTRACT does not clearly present objects, methods, and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are some errors mainly in the way that some statements are written. For example, a research question should not be formulated in such a way that its answer is YES/NO (eg Will the new technologies related to tourism completely change the way tourists travel?) this needs to be reformulated. Furthermore, the literature review must be enhanced with more sources. Furthermore, there are some mistakes in the in-text citations (the way they are listed needs attention. We only use the last name and date, not the initial of the author's name- for example (Capannari L, 2022)

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

This section is well explained.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is clear, with proper sections in general. However, the discussion section does not include any comparison with the literature with specific authors mentioned in the literature review, so I think that it should be written again.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

There are again some mistakes (1. Benasso S. Cuzzocrea V. (2019, does not use comma, then 2. Buhalis, should be numbered with a and b as there are two papers of the same author), while there are sources such as 9. Gursoy, D., Malodia, S., & Dhir A. (2022). The metaverse in the hospitality and tourism industry: an overview of current trends and future research directions, Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management, 31(5), 527-534., 14. Puerto, S. (2022). Hotel distribution 2050. Milan: Hoepli Editor, 1. Taheri, B., Farrington, T., Gori, K., Hogg, G. & O’Gorman, K.D. (2017). Escape, entitlement, and experience: liminoid motivators within commercial hospitality, International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 29(4), 1148-1166., 2. Zaman, U., Koo, I., Abbasi, S., Raza, S.H., & Qureshi, M.G. (2022). Meet your digital twin in space? Profiling international expat’s readiness for metaverse space travel, tech-savviness, Covid-19 travel anxiety and travel fear of missing out. Sustainability, 14(11), 6441.

which are not included within the text.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
