

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

Sakhile Nsukwini¹

¹ University of Mpumalanga

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Manuscript review

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

The topic is relevant and states the geographic location of the study.

Abstract

It is clear and captures the attention of the reader. However, the aim of the study is not clearly stated in the abstract. The number of tourists that participated in the study is not properly stated including the total number of key informants that participated in the study. Furthermore, the data collection period is not stated (when was the data collected).

Introduction

The introduction provides a good context and background on heritage tourism and the research problem in Zimbabwe. The use of outdated references is a bit concerning and I suggest that the authors should try and use references between 2019 to 2023 to demonstrate an understanding of current debates in the literature related to the subject matter. Integration of literature at an international level is strongly encouraged and later use of local examples. I suggest that the problem statement and objectives be embedded in the introduction section. In cases where abbreviations are used for the first time, it is recommended that they be spelled out in full and later abbreviated. The problem statement needs more attention and should be expanded. The authors should clearly state the problem identified in this case study site.

Research methods

This section should describe the study site including the location of the case study site. The map of the study area should also be included. Furthermore, the Authors need to clearly state the research approach the paper adopted and the reason for the selection of the approach. The qualitative approach with 15 tourists and 5 key informant interviews is very small and would suggest that the approach be changed to either quantitative or mixed method to allow generalization. How many tourists that visit this heritage site daily or even monthly?

Results and discussion

The results of the study lack depth, in certain instances, there is only one statement reflecting the opinions of the

participants, this is not enough given that 20 participants were interviewed. This is a case in point under sub-heading 5.1.3. It is also not clear if the results are presented verbatim by participants or if themes were generated in presenting the results. The suggested strategies seem not to emanate from the results of the study. There is a need that some of the suggested strategies to be tied up and linked with the direct results of the study. Results and discussion should also be supported by recent literature on similar studies that were conducted elsewhere.

References

Outdated references are a bit concerning. I strongly suggest that the authors use recent reference (2019-2023) to demonstrate an understanding of current debates in literature. The manuscript uses literature that dates back to 2002. Some references are even two decades old.