

# Review of: "Tourists' Activities and their Impacts on Chinhoyi Caves Heritage Site, Zimbabwe"

Jeremiah Chakuya

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Comments to the manuscript

1. It is not clear on the origins of these tourists. Where these tourist, international, regional or local. Your study should have factored this as this has an impact on the outcome they give. For example, local tourists may have a strong bias if they are associated with the cultural value of a site. Your methodology did not address this fundamental aspect.
2. Were these tourist campers or day visitors? Day visitors and the time they took to explore the area may also differ from campers. Your study should have made efforts to accommodate such kinds of tourists. It was going to be far much better if you could have increased your sample size to cater for such biases.
3. Your results generally are biased. How did you define consumptive tourism? I think the definition of consumptive tourism needs to be refined to suit your study. Smoking, writing on plants and walls use undesignated paths are illegal activities and in most cases, there is staff who guard against such illegal activities.
4. The impact of both consumptive and non-consumptive is not coming out clearly on the mentioned site.
5. The study interviewed tourists and members of the staff. In your results seems you presented only the side of the tourist. Views of the staff are not coming out. Did you use the same questions for the tourist and for the staff? it is not clear.
6. Your research design leaves a lot to desire. There is a need for an overhaul of the research design for this study
7. You used a qualitative approach coupled with a very small sample size to conclude your studies. Surely Chinhoyi Caves is visited by tens if not hundreds of thousands of tourists annually, in this regard, 20 people can not be used to give a scientific conclusion. Why did you decide to use this small sample size?