

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.	The research problem addressed by the research is good and worthy. The tools used for analysing data are good.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it is suitable	
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.	Yes comprehensive but need to take care the journals guidelines	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate	
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.	Scientifically the process of obtaining knowledge and adding a brick of knowledge is good. however, the research does not have any theoretical support, thus need to write for theoretical frameworl	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need to show with native English speaker for language.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See the abstract part it does not match the author's guidelines, • Variables which were used for the study should be named their proper name instead of the name given under data analysis. • Take care of the name of the figure and table, there should be homogeneity, capitalize each word or sentence case or what but should be the same for all. • Table for Unit Root Test is missing • Draw again Figure 2 so that some items in the figure are displayed clearly. • Theoretical base for utilizing data is crucial 	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sarad Chandra Kafle
Department, University & Country	Tribhuvan University, Nepal