Review of: "Use of a Winery's website for wine tourism development: Niagara region"

Ana Sofia Duque[1]

1 Polytechnic Institute of Viseu

Congratulations to the authors for writing and developing this study.

I leave you with some suggestions that could be used to improve the proposal presented, making it more complete.

The abstract is very good. It succinctly summarizes what the article is about.

In the Introduction, when you mention the Niagara Region, I think you could put in parentheses more information about its geographical location (e.g., North/South Canada).

In point 2.1 of the Literature Review, when the authors mention Icewine, I think you should briefly explain what it is. Not all readers will know what it is.

Authors must correct all the references they make throughout the article. You hardly ever follow APA standards; for example, when you cite an author and put the year in front of it, you should be separated by a comma, like this (Vintners, 2023). When citing 2 authors, you should do so as follows (Johnson & Mehrvar, 2020) instead of (Johnson and Mehrvar 2020). And when citing 3 or more authors, you should do so as follows (Xu et al., 2022) instead of (Xu, Yan, and Mak 2022).

In the literature review section, I suggest that the authors start by presenting point 2.3, "The Role of Online Information in Wine Tourism," which is more general, and only then present the information contained in points 2.1 and 2.2, specific to the wine region they are studying.

Once again, authors should be careful how they reference authors and studies in the text. It is not correct. Take the following example from a paragraph in point 2.3. Instead of this: Studies like those by (Molina, Gómez, and Martín-Consuegra 2010) and (Lewis, Kerr, and Burgess 2019) have established the importance of destination image over product brand image alone, suggesting that wineries in the Niagara region could benefit from a unified approach to digital marketing that emphasizes the unique characteristics of the area.
It should be like this: Studies like those by Molina et al. (2010) and Lewis et al. (2019) have established the importance of destination image over product brand image alone, suggesting that wineries in the Niagara region could benefit from a unified approach to digital marketing that emphasizes the unique characteristics of the area.

I don't understand the authors' logic in presenting point 2.5, Theoretical Framework, as part of the literature review. It ends

up being a pointless repetition, since the purpose of the literature review is to provide a theoretical framework for the topics to be covered.

I suggest renaming this point in the literature review and, if possible, placing it at the beginning of the chapter.

In point 3.1. Research Design, Approach, and Data Collection Methods, the authors mention figure 3, but it is missing.

Point 3.2. Coding Classification: The classification process is well explained, but can the authors explain more about how they arrived at the categories analyzed? Were they adapted from other studies? If so, which ones? If not, where did they get the categories?

As far as the results are concerned, I think we need a more in-depth explanation of how the authors arrived at the percentages based on a qualitative yes/no classification.

The conclusions part needs further development and reorganization.

For example, the authors defined 4 research hypotheses. Where is the link between the results and the hypotheses?

Congratulations on creating a topic about *Limitations and Future Research.*

Regarding the references, they are not presented according to APA standards. However, despite not being properly presented, they are relevant and current.

Keep up the good work!