

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_121128
Title of the Manuscript:	Tourism and Economic Growth in Kenya: A Time Series Analysis
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This paper is of significant interest to the scientific community as it examines the dynamic relationship between tourism inflows and economic growth in Kenya. This research is particularly relevant to policymakers and stakeholders in developing countries who wish to leverage tourism for economic development.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Tourism and Economic Growth in Kenya: A Time Series Analysis," is appropriate because it reflects the focus of the research and the methodology used. It effectively captures the essence of the study and its geographical and temporal scope.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The comprehensive abstract details the methodology, key findings, and study implications. However, it would have been nice to have a more explicit statement of the practical implications of the findings and briefly mention the policy recommendations derived from the results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and logically organized, thus facilitating a clear understanding of the research process and findings. Each section systematically builds on the previous section, leading to a well-supported conclusion.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically sound and technically sound, as evidenced by rigorous econometric techniques such as the Vector Error Correction Model (VECM) and Granger causality tests. Comprehensive diagnostic tests and variance decomposition analysis further strengthen the validity of the findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references are adequate and recent, reflecting a thorough understanding of the existing literature. They include important works and recent studies that provide a strong foundation for the research. However, more studies focusing on similar analyses in different regions could provide additional context and support for the findings.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. Minor corrections to correct typographical errors and improve sentence structure would improve readability and clarity.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract: Consider adding a brief statement of policy implications and practical recommendations. Literature Review: While comprehensive, the literature review could benefit from including more research from other areas to contextualize the findings better. Results: Highlight each expected finding and its potential implications in more detail. 	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Artamevia Salsabila Rizaldi
Department, University & Country	Telkom University, Indonesia