

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_129088
Title of the Manuscript:	THE IMPACT OF THE TOURISM INDUSTRY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH IN AFGHANISTAN
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript offers some insights into the impact of tourism industry on the economic growth of Afghanistan. Thus, it has the potential to contribute to the understanding of the nexus between tourism development and economic growth. the findings can guide policy strategies and decision for leveraging tourism industry to achieve higher economic growth for Afghanistan	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the manuscript is suitable	

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>While the abstract provides a concise summary of the article, it could potentially benefit from some adjustments. For instance, the assertion that tourism is the largest and most diverse sector globally should be revisited. In addition, economic growth should be used instead of GDP, since GDP is a proxy for economic growth. Also, unless the data on tourism revenue captures global tourism revenue, global tourism revenue should not be used in the abstract. Furthermore, democratization process and foreign direct investment appear in the abstract but these variables did not appear in the estimated model, neither do they appear in tables that present the ARDL results. Are there explanations for this? What are the implications of the findings of the study for policy?</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The following are my comments about the manuscript.</p> <p>1. Introduction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. It could be better written to improve its flow and coherences. b. the second paragraph contains many statistics without sources. c. Some paragraphs are too short for a paragraph. d. the contribution of the study has not been stated clearly. This could be better stated. e. it is stated in paragraph six that the objective of the study is to investigate the relationship between tourism and economic development. This is not consistent with the topic of the study. Economic growth is not synonymous with economic development. <p>2. Literature review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The information in table 1 can be better presented. For instance, previous studies should not be presented in parenthesis and should be separated from each other a semicolon. b. It needs improvements in terms of stating clearly the techniques used by the authors, the country(ies), and the findings. c. the literature review presentation can be improved for clarity. <p>3. Methodology and database</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The variables used have not been described clearly. b. While an attempt was made to state the hypothesis of the study, the hypothesis is not appropriately stated. c. Equation (1) should be stated to include the error term. Also, to enhance the credibility of the result, the two tourism measures (expenditure and revenue) included in the equation should be used in different models. One for main estimation and other for robustness check. d. The model potentially suffers from omitted variable bias. Some important variables such as exchange rate, and financial development that potentially impact the relationship between tourism and economic growth are not included in the model. e. The error correction equation (equation 2) is miss-specified. This should be corrected. Equation 3 is redundant. f. Some important advantages of ARDL techniques are left out. Including them will add value to the work <p>4. Result and Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Summary statistics and correlation analysis are missing. It should be included b. Equation 4 should not be in this section. The equation and any information about it should be expunged. The cointegration test hypothesis can be stated using equation 1. c. Tourism expenditure is not the same as tourism cost, hence they should not be taken to mean the same thing. d. The interpretation and discussion of the result need improvement. It should be discussed in relation to findings of studies. In addition, the short run estimates should be discussed. e. Table 6 is redundant. <p>4. Conclusion and Policy Implications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Check the paragraph of this section and ensure that there no repetition. ARDL and autoregressive distributed lag mean the same thing. b. It presents the conclusion and policy implications. But ensure that the policy implications only relate to the findings presented in the study. 	
<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 are adequate and contain recent work. However, more recent references can be included.</p>	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality can benefit from some improvements.	
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:	Yunana Ishemu Zumba
Department, University & Country	Nigeria