

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

Carla Bento¹

¹ Instituto Politécnico de Leiria

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Author,

This is a very interesting article and well written.

The introduction is clear. You could mention, when describing the structure of the paper, that this is indeed section 1.

The language is clear, although I feel sometimes it is more lyrical than academic: its rich viticultural tapestry. And you also repeat the word underscore probably too many times.

I am not sure about the reference guidelines you have used, but I must point out:

- marking a 35% growth (Deloitte 2023). Remove the full stop after growth.
- In this sentence and others similar to this one: as explored by (Alant and Bruwer 2010), when referring to an author or authors directly, it would be more suitable to write: as explored by Alant and Bruwer (2010), instead of as explored by (Alant and Bruwer 2010). This is further supported by the work of Cohen and Ben-Nun (2009).
- (Telfer 2000). Again, this has to do with your reference guidelines: why not place a comma between the author and the year: (Telfer, 2000).
- Your Figure 2 – excellent – does not have any references: did you create it, did you adapt it, or?
- Put the references first, then the appendices.

When introducing an abbreviation, you should always clarify what it means: Vintners Quality Alliance (VQA), and then you can use it throughout the paper. You did it very well with corporate identity (CI).

The currency you mention: is it CA\$ or USD? This is relevant for international readers.

When you mention, in the Gaps section, content strategies with references from 1999 and 2000, that can cause some confusion for readers because of how old they are concerning such a recent topic. Hasn't anything else been written since then?

The methodology needs to be improved. You mention 89 wineries, and this is your sample. How many are there? How does the reader know it is representative? Why did you choose these 89? What were the criteria?

You mention you collected the data in July 2023, and on page 13 you mention 2022. Please check.

You should also connect the existing gaps in research to the hypotheses you elaborate on, not just list them. And then you do not mention if these are supported or not by your research. You should also support a bit more the use of the Chi-square test in this case. The Chi-square test is a statistical test used to determine the probability that two categorical data variables are independent. This is why I ask.

The conclusions should be better related to the recommendations found in the literature review. How are these results

significant in the light of the existing gaps, and how useful are they for the wineries? You mention some; it will make the article more relevant if you explore more of those recommendations.

If you need me to clarify anything, feel free to contact me.

Thank you, and keep up the good work.