

Review of: "Politics of Representation in Rural Tourism Micro-Entrepreneurship"

Nikolay Natchev¹

¹ Shumen University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

For the review process of this manuscript, I was selected from the AI as an invited reviewer, and despite the fact that I do not work mainly in the field of tourism, I accepted the call. As a specialist in the natural sciences with only a peripheral interest in the field of the manuscript, I accepted to review the text from the point of view that I may contribute to some technical aspects. The author had prepared a high-quality study and had used rather modern and up-to-date methods. The work was performed precisely and soundly. The study is definitely contributing to the field and will be cited. The results are clear and soundly presented. As I am not quite sure about the future "final acceptance" strategy of the magazine, I will recommend acceptance; however, I would like to introduce to the author some of my ideas concerning the improvement of the manuscript and make it more reader-friendly and citable.

In my opinion, the manuscript has to be revised, and a second version has to be prepared. Despite that, I will rate the manuscript with maximum credits in case the author does not accept my concepts and would like to retain the current form of the text. I am not a native speaker, so I would not provide corrections on the style; however, I would like to point out that some paragraphs are written in a rather "humanitaristic" style and this may disappoint some readers and discourage them from reading the study to the end. My main struggle was to overcome the discrepancy of using rather "mathematical" methods to obtain results but using "non-mathematical" language to explain them.

From a structural point of view, I would recommend a deep reorganization of the text.

The introduction is way too long and somewhat confusing. It is not clear in which direction the text is leading. There is no structured working hypothesis at the end of the introduction, and the presence of some sections is also rather questionable. The section concerning Orientalism is out of scope, as the region of North Carolina has nothing in common with eastern Europe, Asia, or Africa in economic, civilizational, or culturological context. This may be a legitimate concept in social anthropology, but it is improper in the present manuscript. The author may use this concept in the discussion section, but not in the introduction.

The Result section represents the work well, but the discussion is rather short and does not interpret the results in the proper way. There are so many discussion points coded in the results. As a specialist in ethology, I would like to become more information concerning the fact that not only the content of an image, but also the quality of the image may reflect on its perception by the beholder. Was this addressed in the selection of the pictures, and is there a possible bias based on image quality differences? There are a lot of methods for image quality control, and the stock sites are applying them

strictly. If the pictures were downloaded from a stock site, this has to be explained. The disproportion between the introduction and the discussion leaves the wrong impression that the author did only little work to contribute to the big amount of already existing knowledge, but this is not the case here. I would like to see a clear and focused analysis of the results in the section, which may lead to the provided conclusion.