

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

Emiliano Gallaga<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad de Ciencias y Artes de Chiapas

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

A very interesting and appealing title research, but I think came short on the doing in it. The authors are right that this type of research is need it at the heritage sites in order to see or know how tourist activity is interacting (good and bad) with it. In this particular case, the overall results is that tourist is killing the attraction.

Comments:

1: I think the sample used (# 15 tourist and 5 workers) was short. The author could use a better more efficient data collection technique to have a bigger sample. In the article, they do not show statistics about the interviews (gender, age, nationality, etc.). Moreover, neither they make distinctions on what the tourist say vs the workers. Is their vision similar, different, if different on which topics, etc.?

2: I like the section that the authors divide the tourist activities at the site. However, the section about graffiti, I found it dangerously that they seem to agree that is fine to do it at the attraction site!!! Is a heritage site, and even if is not, graffiti is not a tolerate activity. Just because is Africa, we tourist are allow to do it? Are graffiti permitted on tourist attractions in Europe?

In this regard, the authors need to make a difference between tourist graffiti (that do not have to be permitted) vs locals cultural activities that may (and I say may) be permitted at the site as a ritual/ceremonial relevance to their ancestors/community. I think the authors do not make a good job in this sense.

Moreover, what about having sex inside the cave? The author do not seems to have a define line of action here either. Not because there is a dark corner in a church or an archaeological site, is ok to have sex on it.

In this regard, I find it that a section on what the workers of the site opinion is, is need it. We know the tourist in general is going to try to break the rule to do what he/she wants. Is the local people, organization, site who need to reinforce the rules, protection, and respect for the site?

3: I think the author need to have a section on what is the local regulations for tourist activities at the site or country. There is not a single reference about it. Is there a conservation project for the site? Is there a national or/and foreigner cooperation for it? Is there a regulation/operation plan of site operation?

4: A description of the site is also missing. The authors assume that the reader know what it is, where is it. Do the authors

describe what type of installations the site have? They only mention electric staircases and light at the cave, some fence at the pool, but nothing else. How many workers work at the site? Are there more administrative personal than caregivers? Is there signs explaining the regulations? Etc.

5: The 5.3 section is very short. Seems that they just put it in a rush. No argument, no data to support the proposal. More work is need it there. Not because is a quantitative short research means less analytical thinking.

6: Same as above for the conclusions.

7: “one image say more than thousand words” I think the article missing more images. A map of the location of the site in the country, a map of the site attractions, an image or collection of images about the attractions for example

In general is a good idea for research, they started strong but finish very week. I recommend more rewriting, have a stronger define position about the activities permitted and not, and reworking the conclusions and recommendations.