



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_47143
Title of the Manuscript:	Climate Change Adaptation and Tourism: Towards Sustainable Tourism development in Kilimanjaro National Park Mountain, Tanzania
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. The Abstract is too long; limit this to 300 words only. The focus of the abstract should be the objectives of the study, what methods were used to accomplish the objectives, and what are the major results or salient findings for each objective of the study. In particular, the Abstract can be presented in one paragraph; summarize the last four paragraphs of the abstract into few sentences and incorporate these to the first paragraph.</p> <p>2. The last part of the Introduction should explicitly state the objectives of the study and not merely the general objective, but the particular objectives as well,</p> <p>3. In the Results section, each particular result presented should clearly correspond to each specific objective stated in the last part of the Introduction (see Comment No. 2 above).</p> <p>4. Regarding the “results of correlation” presented in page 6: If the objective (which should be clearly stated in the Introduction) is merely to determine the relationship between two variables (e.g. perceived impact of climate change – with nominal data presented in Table 1; and available resources – data on which should also be presented), then an appropriate test of relationship or association is enough to attain the objective and there is no need for a regression analysis. But if the objective is to determine the effect of one variable to the other (which should be clearly stated in the Introduction), then a regression analysis is needed but only if the data gathered and other conditions are appropriate for a regression test, and then all the “regression tables”, and not merely the “coefficient table”, should be presented and discussed.</p> <p>5. Each subsection in the Discussion section should also clearly correspond to each presented result per objective of the study. It seems that the last subsection of the Results section (re: Contribution of climate change adaptation on tourism development) should be part of the Discussion section. But if not, there should be a clear distinction on what to put on the Results section and what should already be part of the Discussion section. If no clear distinction can be made, it may be better to integrate the two sections as one Results and Discussion section.</p> <p>6. Each conclusion should also clearly correspond to each stated objective and should be based solely on the results of the study.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. Double check all citations and references. Note that all references cited in the text should be included in the list of references at the end of the paper. And only those references cited in the text should be included in the reference list. In particular:</p> <p>1.1. The following references cited in the text should be appropriately included in the reference list: Minja 2004 (cited in page 2); MNRT 2017 (cited in page 2); Hemp et al. 2005 (cited in page 10-11); Hemp 2005 (cited in page 11); Grimshaw et al. 2005 (cited in page 11); Vice President's Office 2005 (cited in page 12); and WTO 2001 (cited in page 12).</p> <p>1.2. The following references included in the reference list (pages 14-15), which were not cited in the text, should be deleted: Agrawala & Berg 2002; Bamberger 2000; Brock & McGee 2002; Clausnitzer 2001; Coutts 1969; Downie & Wilkinson 1972; Elasha, Tabo & Yanda 2007; Evans, Hastings & Peacock 2000; Grimshaw 1996; Gupta, Shashi & Rangji 2010; Hastenrath 1999; Hastenrath 2001; Hastenrath, Polzin & Mutai 2007; Hemp 1999; Hemp 2001; Hyera & Mwaipopo 2003; Kathor 2014; Kilungu, Munishi, Leemans & Amelung 2014; Kothari 2009; KPAP 2010; Krishnaswami 2009; Kruss 1983; Lambrechts, Woodley, Hemp, Hemp & Nyiti 2002; Little 1970; Mbonile 1999; McCarthy, Canziani, Leary, Dokken & White 2001; McLeod 2015; Meyer 2009; Minja 2012; Mwaipopo 2001; and Mwandosya, Nyenzi & Luhanga 1998.</p> <p>1.3. The reference Hunt 2010 has two entries in the reference list. Delete one.</p> <p>1.4. The reference IPCC 2001 has two entries also. Delete one.</p> <p>1.5. Do some necessary corrections on the following references with incorrect or incomplete entries in the reference list: Leiper 2000; Lwoga 1995; Minja 2014; and Tanzania Tourism Sector Survey 2008.</p> <p>2. Do not start a sentence with a numerical figure. In page 10, for example, instead of “78.9% of the respondents reported ...” this can be written as “It was reported that 78.9% of the respondent ...” Do the same for other sentences that began with a numeral.</p>	
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Romer C. Castillo
Department, University & Country	Batangas State University, Philippines