

***African Journal of Hospitality,
Tourism and Leisure: ISSN: 2223-814X
DOUBLE-BLIND PEER REVIEWERS' TEMPLATE***



Kindly return to: africajournals@hotmail.com

NB. Plagiarized work or work previously published will be rejected out of hand.

If no plagiarism report is submitted the article is rejected.

THIS REVIEW INCORPORATES FEEDBACK RECEIVED FROM TWO SUBJECT-EXPERT ANONYMOUS PEER-REVIEWERS

PART A: rychakuwarasari@yahoo.com

Reviewers' names:	XXXXXXXXXXXX and XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Manuscript number:	Article 25 Vol. 9 (2) 2020
Article title:	Indonesian demographic bonus: Determinants of intention to use the cellular applications of tourism in Indonesia's millennial generation
Author/s:	XXXXXXXXXX
Date sent to reviewer/s:	02/02/2020
Date expected from reviewer:	Within 15 working days or sooner

SECTION I

PART B: Reviewers only

SECTION II: Comments on manuscript

EVALUATION AREAS	SCORE /max	COMMENTS: Please type in the space below
1. Significance and relevance of themes in introduction	7/10	<p>This is this a topic that needs addressing. The area investigated by the paper: is timely and important and in need of addressing. It is intrinsically interesting and filling a gap in current knowledge. By addressing these themes, this paper make a useful contribution.</p> <p>This study aimed to determine how much influence the saving of money, time savings and ease of intention have to use tourism mobile applications in the millennial generation in Bekasi - Indonesia. In contrast to this study the focus is on more specific respondents namely the millennial generation in developing countries such as Indonesia.</p>
2. Sound argumentation	16/20	The paper employs theory in a meaningful way to support the arguments put forward. Theoretical concepts are used in such a way as to make plausible generalisations. The article is closely argued and well - structured and it shows evidence of a high level of competence with regard to

		argumentation, organisation and style.
3. Literature usage	11/15	Authoritative knowledge, coverage, interpretation and application of the relevant literature. The author shows a command of the literature and contextualizes the problem well. The article Includes a discussion of the literature that is selective, analytical, and thematic
4. Methodology	7/10	This research was a quantitative study using a questionnaire as a measurement tool involving 350 millennial generation respondents in Bekasi - Indonesia. From a total of 350 respondents, there were 276 respondents who returned questionnaires and 250 questionnaires that could be used for the next process. The questionnaire in this study uses a Likert scale which is then tested using SPSS 25 software to test the feasibility of indicators and hypotheses. The research on which the paper is based has been well designed. The interpretative potential of the data has been realized and the data has been used effectively to advance the themes that the paper sets out to address.
5. Critique quality	15/20	The article is set out in a systematic way, closely argued and well structured, with excellent coherence in terms of argumentation, organisation and style. The logical progression from research hypotheses to conclusions is very convincing. The paragraphs as a whole form an interwoven, coherent unit.
6. Sound conclusions/ results and /or recommendations	11/15	The conclusions show readers the value of your completely developed argument and the research results show that all indicator items in variables can be used fully. This study explains the significant effect of time savings and ease of intention to use mobile travel applications in the millennial generation in Bekasi, Indonesia, although the money saving variable does not affect the intention to use a mobile travel application in the millennial generation in Bekasi-Indonesia. Preceding research was typically done on respondents who were not specific but rather general in nature.
7. General Impression	7/10	The title of the article is both appropriate and clear. The abstract is specific, representative of the article, and in the correct form and the purpose of the article is made clear in the introduction. The referencing has been done in an almost proper manner and the layout of the bibliography is largely in line with AJHTL acceptable conventions. The

		academic standard of the article is sufficient to merit publication after some revisions.
TOTAL SCORE %	TOTAL =100 74%	

SECTION II (Cont.)

Bibliography/References	Place an X in the appropriate box
Harvard Style	X
Chicago Style	

SECTION III - Please rate: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Acceptable/Fair) (4 = poor) (5 = very poor)

Originality:	1/2
Contribution to the field:	2/1
Technical quality:	2/3
Clarity of presentation:	3/2
Depth of research:	3/3

SECTION IV - Recommendation: (Mark with an X)

Accept outright for immediate publication:	
Accept subject to minor corrections:	XX
Accept subject to moderate revision:	
Requires major revision:	
Reject outright:	

SECTION V: Additional Comments

You are not required to comment unless:

- You have given a low score in any of the evaluation areas or believe you must justify why you have given the paper a high score
- You indicate that a response to any of the evaluation criteria is 'not applicable' because the paper legitimately does not set out to be proficient in a specific area (for instance, pure theory or philosophical conceptual argumentation which does not use conventional 'data').
- You have specific suggestions you would like to provide the author(s) in relation to any of the evaluation areas.
- If you have recommended rejection or revision, then please elaborate in detail.