

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_108347
Title of the Manuscript:	AWARENESS OF ECOTOURISM AMONG MEMBERS OF ACADEMIC STAFF IN THE FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE, USMANU DANFODIYO UNIVERSITY SOKOTO, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p>	<p>It is <u>capable</u> of providing a contextual/ case study illustration of how academicians trained in areas related to natural resource management ought to be proactive in ecotourism activities. It is also <u>capable</u> of highlighting how agricultural programs have components that initiate an awareness of ecotourism and thereby create an interest and desire to engage in activities.</p> <p>It however needs a lot of restructuring to do the above, and therefore be relevant to the scientific community. The findings, analysis, and conceptual basis do not reflect the expressed intentions of the author(s).</p>	
<p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title does not reflect some of the intentions of the author(s), which include establishing that there is a relationship between awareness and engagement in ecotourism. This seems to be the central research problem. The title should therefore read as follows:</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Investigating the Relationship Between Awareness and Ecotourism Engagement Among Agriculture Academicians at Usmanu Danfodiyp University, Nigeria</p>	
<p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p>	<p>It contains too many variables and extra data that have not been adequately interrogated and discussed in the manuscript. The abstract also gives the impression that the author(s) also wish to establish the various factors influencing academicians' participation in ecotourism. This creates a new dimension to the article, and makes the reader question the authors' intention and research problem. The abstract therefore needs to be concise to correctly reflect the scope and gist of the study</p>	
<p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The Introduction section is too long. It contains background to the study, and a bit of the context of the case study i..e Usmanu Danfodiyo University Sokoto. These two can be separately numbered. The Materials and Methods Section contains geographical attributes of the study area which have no relation to the aim and discussion of the study. This section does not fit well in the manuscript. The Sampling Procedure and Sampling Size Section contains insufficient and incorrect data (See Table 1). It is however an appropriate heading and section for the document, which can be merged with the following section of Data Collection (2.3). Results, Discussion and Conclusion are appropriately numbered and relevant to the paper.</p>	
<p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p>	<p>It reflects aspects of a Positivist Worldview in data collection and analysis yet has notable shortcomings in providing a strong conceptual basis for the study variable identification and analysis. The study does not provide a contextual and clear definition for 'Awareness' to validate its measurement and analysis, and differentiate it from other studies that have uses it. e.g Alarape and Oladele (2018), Emmanuel <i>et al.</i> (2017).</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>The study does not have a clear research problem, hypothesis, or questions. Therefore, the findings and analysis are open to discussion out of context.</p> <p>The Regression and Chi-square tests are conducted with variables that have no conceptual basis. Socio economic results are not supported by text.</p>	
<p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>Many of the references are based on Studies linked to Nigeria. However, the author(s) uses them out of context. The Studies look into different variables from this manuscript and their conclusions are different from what the author is reporting e.g Ijose (2018) rites on Hunters Activities and Patters of Bushmetat Trade which does not have much to do with the justification that women are not active participants in ecotourism activities compared to men. The use of the article ignores serous controversies of Hunting tourism in the conservation debates in Africa (see Mkono 2019- Positive Tourism in Africa). Alarape et al 2017 also focuses on Bushmeat consumption and not natural resource conservation and ecotourism.</p> <p>The author(s) need to read on other recent authors who have written about factors influencing ecotourism engagement in the African Context. There has been too much reference to Nigerian authors whose writings are cited out of context.</p> <p>Refer to reports by the Nigerian Tourism Institutions in justifying the low participation in ecotourism. Read the Encyclopaedia of Ecotourism to draw out the contextual definition or scope that will be used for the study, Read on Marslows hierarchy of needs. The expansion from the five-stage model to the seven-stage one which include cognitive and <u>aesthetic needs</u> (Maslow 1970)</p>	
<p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sources need to be cited for some strong statements in the Introduction Section - The article should have a discussion patterns that begins Global and narrows to the local scale - Focus the paper on a single and clear idea 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments	It needs some improvement.	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Chikondi Hansini Banda-Thole
Department, University & Country	The Copperbelt University, Zambia