



Manuscript: **“Examining Motivation and Perception of Visitors at Lekki Conservation Centre (LCC) in Nigeria”**

**Submitted: 09 June 2020**

**Accepted: 04 August 2020**

**Published: 31 October 2020**

Corresponding Author: Olalekan Ayodimeji Tunde-Ajayi

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n29p192

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Blinded

**Reviewer 2:** Blinded

**Reviewer 3:** John R. Philemon  
University of Dar-es-salaam Business School, Tanzania

**Reviewer 4:** T.M.S.P.K. Thennakoon  
University of Sri Jayewardenepura, Sri Lanka

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: JOHN R. PHILEMON	
University/Country: TANZANIA	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 28 <sup>th</sup> July 2020
Manuscript Title: <b>AFTER MOTIVATION, WHAT NEXT? ASSESSMENT OF BEHAVIOURAL INTENTION OF VISITORS AT LEKKI CONSERVATION CENTRE, LAGOS STATE, NIGERIA</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i><b>Questions</b></i>	<i><b>Rating Result</b></i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The title is wordy and mouthful. I would recommend that the title reads: Examining motivation and perception of visitors at Lekki Conservation Centre (LCC) in Nigeria. By paraphrasing, the title becomes succinct and clear. The title is so much about behavioral intentions and not about perception.</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments) there are several weaknesses on the abstract but most importantly, the methodology is not clear. It just mentions that SPSS will be used to carry descriptive and inferential statistics. These are too general.</i></p> <p><i>What do the authors mean by the statement that respondents were selected randomly?</i></p>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments) there are several grammatical errors. This calls for the authors to send the manuscript to a serious and professional English language editor.</i></p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p><i>Instead of describing the methods, the section begins with description of the study area. The section is too brief as if the section is not all that important.</i></p>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>There are several errors. The study relies on 2016, statistics in building the case. This is very old. Almost every year new statistics are provided.</i></li> <li>• <i>Fact: nature based tourism is not a new phenomenon. It has been with us for many years.</i></li> </ul>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p><i>Not clear. The conclusion is not derived from the findings and therefore leaves a lot to be desired. For instance , on the very first sentence of the conclusion it reads:</i></p> <p><b>Concludes that the site has enough attractions to attract visitors especially the Canopy walkway which is the longest canopy walkway in Africa.</b> This is a the conclusion that was not part of what the researchers set out to study.</p>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p><i>The references are comprehensive, but the presentation is not consistent.</i></p>	

1. 31(3), 657–681.
2. Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 86-93.

*One sees these inconsistencies throughout the document's reference list.*

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
<b>Accepted, minor revision needed</b>	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

1. The gap that motivated the authors to undertake this study is not very clear. There is no adequate motivation for the study.
2. The title needs rephrasing as suggested or in any other way that is appropriate.
3. The presentation of the findings and their discussions need to be more focused on the thrust of the study.
4. The presentation and discussion of the findings on the tables can be improved further.
5. The titles of the tables are not consistent with the contents.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: AFTER MOTIVATION, WHAT NEXT? ASSESSMENT OF BEHAVIOURIAL INTENTION OF VISITORS AT LEKKI CONSERVATION CENTRE, LAGOS STATE, NIGERIA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 87.06.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:    Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:    Yes/No	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Policy implications are not mentioned at the end of the abstract</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Conclusion part to be aligned to the objectives clearly</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Policy implications to be included to the abstract. Conclusion part to be explained more to align to the objectives.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**