Review Report Template – Version 1 (Pre-publication)

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56365/5t7xh498.r2

Journal: Scientia International Journal for Social Sciences

Manuscript: "Fidelização Experiencial no Turismo de Aventura de Natureza: A Relação entre Satisfação, Engajamento Sustentável e Intenções de Retorno e Recomendação: Um Estudo Descritivo no Agreste Pernambucano-Brasil"

Authors: Ana Elisabeth de Brito Alves, Luana Cavalcanti de Melo Ataíde, Juliana de Brito Alves Cavalcanti e Eliana Andréa Severo

Reviewer: Marcos Roberto Pisarski Junior – ORCID: [0000-0002-8384-7420]

Report Date: 22/12/2025
Deadline for Version 2: 30 days after receipt of this report

1. Introduction and Greeting

Dear Authors,

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. The study addresses a highly relevant and timely topic at the intersection of experiential consumption, nature-based adventure tourism, and sustainability, combining marketing theory with empirical evidence from an emerging destination context.

Overall, the manuscript demonstrates solid methodological execution, analytical depth, and conceptual coherence. However, while the study meets the minimum quality standards required for dissemination as a preprint, several aspects would benefit from greater theoretical precision,

analytical synthesis, and editorial refinement, which I detail below with the intent of strengthening subsequent versions.

2. Manuscript Overview

The manuscript investigates how experience satisfaction and sustainable engagement influence return intention and recommendation intention among participants in trail and rappelling activities in Gravatá (PE), Brazil. The empirical focus on a non-metropolitan, emerging tourism destination is a clear strength and contributes to diversifying the geographical scope of tourism and marketing research.

That said, the article occasionally overextends descriptively, particularly in the presentation of statistical procedures and intermediate results, at the expense of deeper theoretical abstraction. The contribution would be enhanced by a more explicit positioning of the findings within broader debates on experiential loyalty, behavioral intentions, and sustainability-oriented consumption.

3. Detailed Evaluation

Criterion	Summary Comments	Score[1]
Scientific Relevance	Addresses an important and underexplored context, with clear applied and academic relevance.	5
Originality	The regional focus and the combined analysis of satisfaction and sustainable engagement are valuable, though conceptually close to existing experiential marketing models.	4
Methodological Rigor	Methodology is robust and well executed; however, justification for combining AFE, AFC, and regression (instead of SEM) could be more critically framed.	4
Data Presentation	Analyses are technically correct, but the volume of tables and figures occasionally compromises narrative clarity.	3

Writing Quality	Generally clear, but requires stylistic tightening and improved academic tone in the English abstract and standardization.	4
Theoretical Coherence	Updated and relevant references though some theoretical concepts could be more critically synthesized.	4
Bibliographic References	The references are adequate and relevant, but should be selectively updated with 2020–2025 studies on experiential loyalty and sustainable tourism.	4

[1]Scale from 1 (very unsatisfactory) to 5 (excellent)

4. Section-by-Section Comments

1. **Title and Abstract**
   - The title accurately reflects the empirical scope and key constructs.
   - **Suggestion**: The abstract is overly descriptive. It should explicitly highlight the key counterintuitive finding (the non-positive effect of sustainable engagement on recommendation intention), which is one of the manuscript's most relevant contributions.
2. **Introduction**
   - Strong contextual grounding and relevance justification.
   - **Suggestion**: The introduction could be more concise. Some conceptual repetitions regarding experience, satisfaction, and experiential consumption should be reduced to improve argumentative focus.
3. **Methodology**
   - Clear description, adequate sample size, and appropriate statistical techniques.
   - **Suggestion**: The choice not to use SEM should be discussed more critically, especially given the AFC and latent construct modeling already employed.
4. **Results**

press.scientia.international
press@scientia.international
@ScientiaOn
ESPAÑA:
Calle Campus Universitario de Espinardo, 7
Espinardo, Murcia, 30100
NIF: B19838929
BRASIL:
Avenida Paulista, 1744, Sala 1110
São Paulo, SP, 01311-927
CNPJ: 51.097.242/0001-86

- Statistical analyses are sound and transparently reported.
- **Suggestion**: The section is excessively detailed. Some intermediate outputs could be summarized or moved to appendices to improve readability.

5. **Discussion and Conclusion**
   - The discussion of the rejected hypothesis (H4) is one of the strongest parts of the paper. Coherent synthesis and relevant linkage to the SDGs.
   - **Suggestion**: This section should engage more explicitly with theoretical implications, rather than primarily restating empirical findings. The manuscript would benefit from a clearer separation between theoretical contributions, managerial implications, and policy relevance.
6. **Multilingual Writing**
   - The English abstract contains literal constructions and should be revised for academic fluency and stylistic coherence, the portuguese writing is excelente.

5. Questions and Dialogue

- How do the authors conceptually differentiate *experiential loyalty* from traditional loyalty constructs in marketing literature?
- Could the negative relationship between sustainable engagement and recommendation be interpreted through social or relational mediators (e.g., perceived risk, social capital, peer compatibility)?
- Do the authors envision the model being tested in other biomes or cultural contexts to strengthen external validity?

6. Rounds and Publication Plan

Round	Reviewer's Action	Author's Action	Publication	Deadline

1	Initial report and quality assessment	Revise text according to suggestions	Version 1 – Preprint[2]	30 days
2	Evaluation of Version 2	Address reviewer and community feedback	Version 2 – Revised	15 days
3[3]	Final Report and Approval	---	Final Version + Complete History	Immediate

[2]Published online with its own DOI and metadata in six languages after my approval of the minimum quality.

[3]Only if major revisions are requested; otherwise, skip to final publication.

7. Final Recommendation for Version 1

- **[X] Publish Version 1 – Preprint**
- [ ] Request minor revisions
- [ ] Request major revisions
- [ ] Reject

8. Closing

This manuscript presents a **methodologically solid and empirically relevant contribution** to the fields of tourism studies and experiential marketing. While it requires **conceptual tightening, narrative synthesis, and stylistic refinement**, it clearly meets the standards for publication as a **Version 1 – Preprint** within the open and dialogical review model adopted by *Scientia International Journals*.

I look forward to reviewing a revised version that further strengthens the manuscript's theoretical positioning and analytical clarity.

Sincerely,

Marcos Roberto Pisarski Junior

ORCID: 0000-0002-8384-7420

press.scientia.international
press@scientia.international
@ScientiaOn

ESPAÑA:
Calle Campus Universitario de Espinardo, 7
Espinardo, Murcia, 30100
NIF: B19838929

BRASIL:
Avenida Paulista, 1744, Sala 1110
São Paulo, SP, 01311-927
CNPJ: 51.097.242/0001-86