

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

Karoly Nemeth¹

¹ Massey University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This manuscript, titled as "Tourists' Activities and their Impacts on Chinhoyi Caves Heritage Site, Zimbabwe" present a very valid and important issue associated with the conservation of heritage site and the promotion of geotourism in general. The manuscript is well structured, uses direct language and a logical flow of argument. The research is based on direct data collection and a analytical work to see the impact of tourism of a less known heritage site in Zimbabwe.

While the term "heritage tourism" is kind of self-explanatory, I still would have been happy to see some definitive paragraph where this is explicitly outlined and compared with other niche tourism elements. The Introduction is the right place to have some extra section added. Also, some numbers of direct statistical data to support the claims that we experiencing an elevated "hunger" for heritage site visitation would be a good addition. This also could be further distinguished by some countries, as examples. The article claims well that we have very little direct knowledge what tourist doing in specific sites and how heritage sites taking their share on the impact of tourism. I really like this approach as firm data can help to shape the management strategy what need to be done and how tourism activity need to be managed (if that can be managed at all ...). Maybe this concept could have been elaborated better in the form of 2-3 lines to show how realistic to separate tourism from the general education level of the society (and visitors) and other elements of (geo)conservation. Some sort of comparative outline (based on literature review) would be a good addition in the Introduction where this problem is outlined (e.g., just to see some examples of the behavior of tourist in various locations and see if there is any reported correlation between the general scene of the specific society toward heritage). The section "Tourist activities" are good summary, but to elevate the value of it, some sort of tabular presentation to see if there is any correlation between specific locations and specific behavior would be a very valuable addition.

The "Research methods" are interesting but some sort of "self-justification" or "self-evaluation" of the representativeness of the method would have been good addition. 15 "random" report may not be representative, however certainly informative.

You need to provide a proper introduction what ATLAS.ti 8 does. It seems it is an AI, but you must provide details what and how this systems works, and what input data, preferences and other technical details need to be set to deliver some information that make sense. This seems to be the core of your research hence proper introduction is needed.

Later on, you use many specific terms such as "consumptive land-based activity" you need to provide clear definition of

this to make sure the reader understand this in a same way you use it. As the information is in the section, you might need just rearrange the section (and the other ones) following some structured order.

As the various sections on activity follows the AI-designed method outline, the reader cab be disconnected between these activity documentation and the AI-aided method. Somehow not evident where the data and where the method applied. I find difficult to have connection here between the methods outlined and the information extracted and shown in these sections.

The manuscript is missing some strong discussion. As I outlined above, if you provide some global framework in the Introduction, then it is relatively easy to prepare a global comparative Discussion section. With this framework the manuscript could be more powerful and also more useful for others.

Overall I think the manuscript needs some major revision to be an internationally significant work.