



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_49871
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigating Pricing Strategies of Hotel Rooms in City Centre: A Case Study
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>(1) Contribution This research is based on the data of 25 hotels with star ratings from 2 to 4 are selected in the heart of Georgetown, Penang. It seems that the contribution of this research also lies in this sample towards pricing strategies for these hotel rooms. Readers may wonder identifying an evaluation model is the same important for different countries. That is, please discuss more about the contribution of this research and explain how the research findings can be used to give values to different culture or country.</p> <p>(2) Methods Please include more information about the survey process. For example, when the survey was conducted, for how long? Why agoda.com platform not others? What is the criteria that you choose the data?</p> <p>(3) Theoretical and managerial implications Please extend the discussions in this paper and link them to the contribution. In this paper, the theoretical and managerial implications are linked to the empirical findings. Instead of linking to the empirical results, it is recommended to emphasize what the previous studies could not identify but this paper did.</p>	<p>1) The contribution has been highlighted in introduction</p> <p>2) The clarification has been improved.</p> <p>3) The discussion on contribution has been extended.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	(1) Please provide information about 'the structure of the remainder of the paper' at the end of introduction part.	1) The structure has been added
Optional/General comments		