

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_113902
Title of the Manuscript:	Tea Tourism: Navigating the Future of Assam's Agritourism
Type of the Article	This can be categorized as a review article in the field of tourism and regional development

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Importance for the Scientific Community: The manuscript holds significance for the scientific community as it delves into the challenges faced by tea tourism in Assam and proposes strategic recommendations for its development. The comprehensive analysis of obstacles, coupled with actionable suggestions, provides valuable insights for researchers, policymakers, and practitioners interested in sustainable tourism development. 2. Suitability of the Title: The title, "Challenges and Opportunities in Assam's Tea Tourism: A Comprehensive Analysis," effectively conveys the manuscript's focus. However, to enhance specificity, you might consider a more concise title like "Navigating Challenges in Assam's Tea Tourism" or "Unlocking Assam's Tea Tourism Potential." 3. Comprehensiveness of the Abstract: The abstract is well-structured and offers a concise summary of the manuscript, covering key aspects such as challenges, recommendations, and socio-economic impacts. It effectively provides an overview, making it suitable for readers seeking a quick understanding of the paper. 4. Appropriateness of Subsections and Structure: The subsections and overall structure are well-organized, guiding the reader through the challenges, suggestions, and socio-economic impacts systematically. This approach enhances readability and comprehension, contributing to the overall effectiveness of the manuscript. 5. Scientific Accuracy: The manuscript appears scientifically sound, presenting a logical and evidence-based analysis of the challenges faced by tea tourism in Assam. The recommendations align with industry best practices and contribute to the scholarly discourse on sustainable tourism development. 6. References and Ethical/Competing Interest Issues: The references are appropriate, but it would be beneficial to include a broader range of recent sources to strengthen the literature review. Ensure that all sources are cited correctly. There are no apparent ethical or competing interest issues in the manuscript. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript demonstrates a proficient command of English, with coherent sentence structures and appropriate academic vocabulary. However, there may be occasional areas where language clarity or technical terminology could be further improved for enhanced readability and comprehension, especially for an international audience. A thorough proofreading or language editing process may help refine the language quality to meet the rigorous standards of scholarly communication. Overall, while the language quality is adequate, minor refinements could enhance its suitability for scholarly publications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In summary, the manuscript is important for the scientific community, with a suitable title and a comprehensive abstract. The structure is well-designed, and the scientific content is accurate. Consider enhancing the reference list with more recent sources for a more comprehensive overview. There are no evident ethical or competing interest concerns.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Gde Deny Larasdiputra
Department, University & Country	Warmadewa University, Indonesia