Corresponding Author: Elisa Rancati

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Olusola Folorunso
Kwara State University, Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
Title is clear and well structured
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
Abstract is detailed. However, personalization of statement should be corrected. Like the use of 'we'
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
A few, the work should undergo a second proof reading.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Very clear.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The reference (citations) should be linked to the subject matter in such a way that the gap in literature will contribute to the survey and helped in the conclusion of the study.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
Conclusion should ne enriched by highlighting gaps in literature and what this study has done to fill while addressing the main objectives of the study.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
Reference should not be itemized.
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[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]
3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Well done, to the team. Kindly address the minor corrections highlighted so far to enrich your study. Implication of the subject matter on the acceptability of the visitors in relation to the host communities should form part of future research.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: See Comments

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article
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 results of the paper are fluid, clear and rich in ideas for future insights
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
It's explained cleary and appropriate to the contents
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
The references are 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]
4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

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]
3

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
a small revision introducing more updated references