

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_121438
Title of the Manuscript:	DECIPHERING THE CHALLENGES IN AGROTOURISM THROUGH RANK-BASED QUOTIENT (RBQ) ANALYSIS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. It provides valuable insights into the challenges faced by agrotourism entrepreneurs in a specific region (Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India), which can inform policymakers and stakeholders on how to better support this growing sector.2. The study uses a systematic approach (Rank Based Quotient analysis) to prioritize and rank the challenges faced by agrotourism ventures, offering a clear picture of which issues are most pressing and require immediate attention.3. By examining challenges across multiple domains (financial, legal, management, and marketing), the research offers a comprehensive view of the obstacles in developing successful agrotourism businesses, which can guide future research and interventions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	However, to make the title more specific and informative, a slight modification could be considered. Here's a suggested alternative: "ANALYZING AGROTOURISM CHALLENGES IN COIMBATORE, INDIA: A RANK-BASED QUOTIENT (RBQ) APPROACH"	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>there are a few areas where it could be improved: Suggestions for addition:</p> <p>Include the sample size (10 agrotourism venturers) in the abstract to give readers an immediate sense of the study's scope. Briefly mention some of the top challenges identified through the RBQ analysis. This would provide more concrete information about the study's findings. Add a brief sentence about the practical implications of the research, such as how it can inform policy or support agrotourism development.</p> <p>Suggestions for improvement:</p> <p>The abstract could be more concise in some areas. For example, the description of agrotourism's benefits could be shortened to allow more space for key findings. The keywords could be more specific. Consider adding terms like "RBQ analysis," "rural development," or "entrepreneurship challenges." The JEL Classification seems oddly placed in the abstract. This is typically included separately, not within the abstract itself.</p> <p>Revised abstract (example): "Agrotourism, blending agriculture and tourism, offers significant potential for rural development in regions like Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India. This study aims to identify and analyze the principal challenges faced by agrotourism entrepreneurs using Rank Based Quotient (RBQ) analysis. Data were collected from 10 agrotourism venturers through structured questionnaires, focusing on financial, marketing, infrastructural, and regulatory challenges. The RBQ analysis revealed that securing capital for infrastructure and operations, obtaining permits and licenses, and dealing with increased competition were among the top challenges. By prioritizing these challenges, this research provides valuable insights for policymakers and stakeholders to develop targeted interventions, enhancing the sustainability and growth of agrotourism in the region. The findings can inform policy decisions and support strategies for overcoming barriers in agrotourism development." Keywords: Agrotourism, RBQ Analysis, Rural Development, Entrepreneurship Challenges, Coimbatore</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Ethical considerations are explicitly addressed, indicating adherence to research ethics principles, which is crucial for scientific integrity. While the sample size is relatively small (10 agrotourism venturers), which may limit generalizability, the use of the RBQ method helps to mitigate this limitation by providing a robust way to analyze and rank the challenges within this specific context. Overall, the manuscript demonstrates scientific rigor in its approach, analysis, and presentation of findings.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-</p>	<p>The references in this manuscript are generally sufficient and provide a good foundation for the study. However, there are some areas where the reference list could be improved: Recency: While the reference list includes some recent publications, many of the cited works are from the 2000s and early 2010s. The most recent reference appears to be from 2017. To strengthen the manuscript, it would be beneficial to include more recent studies (from 2018-2023) on agrotourism challenges and developments. Geographical relevance: Given that the study focuses on Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India, it would be valuable to include more references specific to agrotourism in India or South Asia. Methodological references: While the RBQ method is mentioned, additional references on this analytical approach could strengthen the methodological justification.</p> <p>Suggestions for additional references:</p> <p>Bhatta, K., & Ohe, Y. (2020). A review of quantitative studies in agritourism: The implications for</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>developing countries. <i>Tourism and Hospitality</i>, 1(1), 23-40. Kline, C., Barbieri, C., & LaPan, C. (2016). The influence of agritourism on niche meats loyalty and purchasing. <i>Journal of Travel Research</i>, 55(5), 643-658. Nazariadli, S., Morais, D. B., Barbieri, C., & Smith, J. W. (2018). Does perception of authenticity attract visitors to agricultural settings?. <i>Tourism Recreation Research</i>, 43(1), 91-104.</p> <p>Including these or similar recent references would enhance the manuscript's currency and broaden its perspective, particularly in relation to agrotourism in developing countries and the Indian context. Additionally, incorporating more recent studies could provide updated insights on the evolving challenges and opportunities in the agrotourism sector.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <p>The overall structure of the article follows a logical flow expected in academic writing. Technical terms related to agrotourism and the RBQ analysis are used appropriately. The writing is generally clear and conveys the research objectives, methodology, and findings effectively.</p> <p>Areas for improvement:</p> <p>Grammar and syntax: There are occasional grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that could be refined. For example, in the abstract: "Utilizing a structured questionnaire, data were collected from 10 agrotourism venturers" could be rephrased to "Data were collected from 10 agrotourism venturers using a structured questionnaire."</p> <p>Consistency: There are some inconsistencies in capitalization, especially in the headings and subheadings. For instance, "FINANCIAL CHALLENGES FACED BY THE AGROTOURISM VENTURERS" vs. "Legal challenges faced by the agrotourism venturers."</p> <p>Punctuation: There are instances where commas could be added or removed to improve readability.</p> <p>Formal tone: While generally maintained, there are a few instances where the language could be more formal. For example, "Having enough capital" could be rephrased as "Securing sufficient capital."</p> <p>Clarity: Some sentences are long and could be broken down for better clarity. For instance, in the literature review section, there are several complex sentences that could be simplified.</p> <p>Proofreading: There are a few typographical errors that a thorough proofreading could catch.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>A thorough copy-editing process would help refine the language and correct minor grammatical and punctuation issues. Standardizing the format of headings and subheadings would improve the overall presentation. Having a native English speaker or a professional academic editor review the manuscript could help elevate the language quality to a higher scholarly standard.</p> <p>While the current language quality is acceptable for conveying the research content, addressing these points would enhance the article's readability and professional presentation, making it more suitable for high-level scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

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:	Muthana Faaeq Almasaoudi
Department, University & Country	University of Kerbala, Iraq, University Sains Malaysia, Malaysia