

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_106527
Title of the Manuscript:	Socio-economic determinants of Local Tourism Industry Development in Tanzania: A case of Tarangire National Park, Arusha Region
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This study was undertaken in Tarangire national park northern, Tanzania and aimed to examine the perception of local community on local tourism industry and investigating the socio-economic determinants of local tourism development in order to inform the best approaches to be used as a catalyst for local tourism development in Tanzania. But when we reach to conclusions, they don't answer directly to these goals. So, it is important to rewrite conclusions adapting them to these goals.</p> <p>Yes, this title is appropriate for the content of this research.</p> <p>Yes, it clear and shows everything that must appear in an Abstract</p> <p>No. Section 2 "Theoretical Literature Review" has only 2 small paragraphs. It must be rewritten with much more discussion and reflection from the authors. They should also add some references from 2022 and 2023 to this section.</p> <p>The document is scientifically appropriate. But final references must all be corrected taking into consideration APA norms. Besides authors could complement this document with more recent references.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>As it is, no. But if authors perform the proposed changes it will certainly be an important document to the scientific community. On the other hand, methodologically, this is a very interesting document since the collected sample is a result of various years.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eduardo Moraes Sarmiento
Department, University & Country	Lisbon School of Economics and Management, Portugal