

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_126665
Title of the Manuscript:	Farm to Tourists: Exploring the challenges for agro-tourism in Kurupetta Division in Sri Lanka.
Type of the 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is valuable for its insights into agro-tourism challenges in Sri Lanka, contributing to sustainable tourism and rural development literature. The study's findings on infrastructure, land, and skill limitations offer practical implications for policymakers and developers in similar rural settings.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is appropriate but could be refined to: <i>"Challenges and Developmental Strategies for Agro-Tourism in Kurupetta Division, Sri Lanka"</i> to emphasize the study's focus on both challenges and potential strategies.</p>	
<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>The abstract is well-structured but should briefly include the specific data analysis method (thematic analysis) and key findings to give a more complete overview.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is logically organized with clear sections. The flow from challenges to proposed strategies is smooth, and the literature review and discussion are thorough, providing strong support for the findings.</p> <p>However, I have some comments:</p> <p>First, the qualitative methodology is suitable for exploring challenges in agro-tourism. However, a brief justification for why qualitative methods (and specifically thematic analysis) were chosen over quantitative or mixed methods could strengthen the research design section. The methodology should be written more about data collection and process to collect data, as well as the reason to choose these key informants? How to check the reliability of the answers?</p> <p>Second, give a comparison discussion about these answer will make the paper better quality.</p> <p>Third, regarding to depth of Literature Review, the literature review provides a solid foundation but could be expanded with more recent studies on agro-tourism challenges in comparable rural areas worldwide. Additionally, incorporating a brief overview of successful agro-tourism strategies from other countries would provide valuable context and contrast.</p> <p>Fouth, Policy Implications and Practical Recommendations While the study provides general recommendations, elaborating on specific actions for local policymakers would increase its practical utility. For instance, concrete examples of training programs or infrastructure initiatives tailored to Kurupetta could be helpful for stakeholders.</p> <p>Fifth, the paper touches on government support but could delve deeper into how specific policies or financial incentives could mitigate challenges in agro-tourism. Providing case studies of successful government interventions in similar sectors would make this section more impactful.</p> <p>Moreover, the discussion should be writeen separately.</p> <p>Lastly, it is necessary to mention about limitations and future research directions.</p> <p>Although the study's scope is clear, a short section discussing limitations—such as the sample size or regional focus—would add transparency. Additionally, suggesting future research directions, like a comparative study across multiple divisions, would indicate the broader applicability of the findings.</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>The study is methodologically sound, with qualitative data from in-depth interviews offering real-world perspectives. The discussion effectively relates findings to existing literature, particularly on infrastructure and skill gaps in rural tourism, making the study robust.</p>	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant, but a few recent (2022–2023) sources would strengthen the study. Adding international comparisons could also provide useful context.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language Quality The language is mostly suitable, though some phrases need minor grammatical corrections for improved clarity and readability.	
Optional/General comments	Accept but need minor revision The author should address all these comments above to improve the quality of paper.	

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:	Ha Van Trung
Department, University & Country	Wuhan University, China