



Paper: “How do Travel Bloggers Influence Generation Z’s Travel Decisions? An Exploratory Study through Five Italian Famous Travel Bloggers”

Submitted: 09 January 2025

Accepted: 15 February 2025

Published: 28 February 2025

Corresponding Author: Elisa Rancati

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n4p17

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mohammed Kerbouche
University of Mascara, Algeria

Reviewer 2: Alfateh Fegada
University of Pannonia, Veszprem, Hungary

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Mohammed kerbouche	
University/Country: Mascara University Algeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 14/01/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/01/2025
Manuscript Title: How do travel bloggers influence Generation Z's travel decisions? An exploratory study through five Italian	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0152/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title, "How do travel bloggers influence Generation Z's travel decisions? An exploratory study through five Italian famous travel bloggers," is concise and reflects the study's focus on the impact of travel bloggers on Generation Z. It appropriately conveys the content and purpose of the article.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
The abstract outlines the research objective, methodology (mixed qualitative and quantitative survey design). However, it could benefit from greater detail about the results and their implications to provide a clearer summary.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The methodology section is comprehensive, detailing the mixed-method approach, sampling techniques, and data collection procedures. However, some parts could be streamlined for better clarity, particularly the explanation of pretests and the reasoning behind the selected sample.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are presented logically and are supported by appropriate data. Tables or visual aids might enhance understanding and readability. Additionally, the findings regarding the limited influence of travel bloggers on Generation Z are insightful but could benefit from more statistical analysis.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusions align with the study's findings, emphasizing the limited but growing influence of travel bloggers. The discussion of managerial implications is strong but could expand on how these insights might guide future research or practical applications in tourism marketing.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The article includes a robust list of references relevant to the study's themes. Most sources are recent and from credible journals. However, some formatting inconsistencies in citations need correction to adhere to a specific referencing style.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Alfateh Fegada	
University/Country: University of Pannonia / Hungary.	
Date Manuscript Received: 14.01.25	Date Review Report Submitted: 25.01.25
Manuscript Title: How do travel bloggers influence Generation Z's travel decisions? An exploratory study through five Italian famous travel bloggers	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0152/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: YES	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>The author needs to add some details for Quantitative method (e.g., tools used, process of treating data)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1. I did not see any table or figures that could likely enrich the contents. At least the author can share some qualitative infographics referring to the data collection instruments or analysis.
2. The author has to attach an Appendixes of the questionnaire and the TRUSTWORTHINESS of qualitative result!

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: