

Paper: "The Impact of Rural Tourism on the Economic Growth of Rural Residents in Bangladesh: A Study on Melandaha Upazila in Jamalpur District"

Submitted: 11 November 2023 Accepted: 23 December 2023 Published: 31 December 2023

Corresponding Author: Nora Islam

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n34p19

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Murry Siyasiya
1. Malawi Institute of Journalism
2. Blantyre International University

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title explains clearly the content and the methodology

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is clear and rich of details

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

no GRAmmatical errors

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

It's explained cleary and appropriate to the behavior under consideration

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is fluid and clear

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes, the conclusions are well supported

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

More updated references are appreciated

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent] 4 Please rate the METHODS of this paper. [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent] 4 Please rate the BODY of this paper. [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent] 4 Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper. [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent] 4 Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper. [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent] 4 **Overall Recommendation!!!** Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

Reviewer P:
Reviewel 1.
Recommendation: Revisions Required
recommendation. Te visions required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The tittle appears to be more of an article (as indeed stated in the Abstract) and not a research paper. The topic should be restated and should sound something like: The Impact of Rural Tourism on Economic Growth of Rural Residents (as stated in the Abstract).

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Abstract is well summarised

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The article has few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The Methods are not explained clearly because of the following reasons:

- 1) The first specific objective is not clear
- 2) The order of the sections
- 3) The last paragraph of the Methodology is dedicated to defining what items are and not how they have been used in the research process.
- 4) Sampling Technique is not very clear considering that the study relied heavily on primary data
- 5) It is not clear how the SWOT Analysis was conducted

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The paper is fairly clear with some less worrisome errors

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is accurate although the results have not been discussed properly as the researcher did not explain probable reasons why some variables were found to be significance or not, that is, what literature suggest on the findings.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The References are appropriate.

```
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
3
Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
3
Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
2
Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
3
Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
4
Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
```

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

Overall Recommendation!!!	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):	
The paper should be revised, focusing on the topic, objectives, methodology discussion of findings	y and

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4