

Review of: "Agritourism: a source for socio-economic transformation in developing economies"

Merve Yazar Yıldıztekin¹

¹ Gazi University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

- Abstract is too long and introduction is too short.
- Abstract is very disorganized.
- Abstract should start with the background, not directly with the method of the study, then the purpose/hypothesis and method of the study and finally the findings should be mentioned.
- In abstract the word of "extrapolate" is not convenient, "come through" or "come a conclusion" would have been more proper.
- The introduction is just like a background, however, it should introduce the whole of the study to us, the purpose, hypothesis, questions, methodology of the study, what topics are mentioned in which sections and finally the findings obtained should be included in the introduction part.
- references used are up-to-date, it's positive, but primary sources should be used.
- How was the Conceptual framework reached, how was this framework developed, and from what sources was this framework created?
- In the subtitles of conceptual framework references are insufficient, there are even sections that refer to a single reference. In addition, some texts seem to have forgotten the reference, for example:
"For these enterprises, infrastructure investments are required, including those for farming equipment, kitchens for preparing food, marketing, and transportation. Additionally, in order to cover all of their costs, including those for maintaining the farm or ranch, agritourism businesses must be able to effectively manage their funds. For instance, upkeep expenses for infrastructure, fences, irrigation systems, and other equipment are ongoing and necessitate continuous investment. Funding is one of the key elements in the model."
- While waiting to start the study after the conceptual framework, the world examples suddenly comes, however, these are the things that must have been in background of the study and should have been discussed and completed before the conceptual framework, I think the conceptual framework should have consisted of these references.
- None of the sections are linked to the another. Sustainable development goals and the conceptual framework is floating in the air. I think the conclusion part came out of world examples.
- The study as a whole is not consistent. There is no relationship between the sections. The conceptual framework is not well established. The purpose, hypothesis, method and result of the study are not clear. In fact, the subject is a dynamic and interesting one. It needs serious work.

