

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_127234
Title of the Manuscript:	CHALLENGES FACING THE DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURAL TOURISM IN TANZANIA: A CASE OF MTO WA MBU - MONDULI COUNSEL
Type of the Article	Original research

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 <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.	It is more important for the practitioners than for scientific community, but taking in account relatively small number of research coming from Tanzania, it is relevant for all of us that want to research and discuss North-South relations. It offers us some (known) insights in the problem of development, that is linking cultural heritage and tourism, but only seeing culture as economic potential (as commodified), not having insights of potential risks of commodification.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is O.K., although it is promising more – challenges! We do not go deeply into challenges, it is State of the art in the tourism development of that district...	
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.	I suggested to make from the abstract, throughout the text the clear usage of the terms linked to territorial decoupage of the country: as once it is Council, then District, then Region, then Area etc. It has to be clear what is what / and is the region bigger of the District or vice versa etc.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	The methodology applied is correct: combining qualitative (interviews) with qualitative (surveys) approach. However, I would need more interpretation of data (using quotations from interviews for example), and at least few illustrative examples – how certain heritage can be included in tourist offer with a help of a concrete community, association of citizen etc. There is a complete lack of usage of literature in the analysis of data – and MOST of references are not quoted in the text at all, like they are there just to show academic literacy of the authors. Also, the References stop at the letter I (Ichumbaki...), and that is not even half of the alphabet... so, I have to admit, it seems that to the real references author just add more from the beginning of someones reference list, and then get tired in copy-pasting reference... Normally I would not really go through it, but I have remarked some that have no link at all with a topic, and I tried to find them in the text – and they are not there, like Anderson S., or Andlib, etc.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	They are recent, but most of them not USED in the text. It would be interesting to see how (some of them) could be incorporated in the recommendations (coming from other areas and regions – if they are there, they could be inspirational – but authors are not using them at ALL)	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is OK	
Optional/General comments	I put comments in the text	

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:	Milena Dragičević Šešić
Department, University & Country	University of Arts Belgrade, Serbia