



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Integrating Sustainability Education into Rural Tourism Development: A Conceptual Framework and Models for Agritourism and Community Growth”

Submitted: 13 August 2026

Accepted: 31 August 2026

Published: 30 September 2026

Corresponding Author: Nino Sachaleli

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n25p52

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ikram Bel Haddioui
La Cité College, Ottawa, Canada

Reviewer 2: Elsa Aranda Pastrana
Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez, México

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Elsa Aranda Pastrana	
University, Country: Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez/México	
Date Manuscript Received: Aug 19	Date Review Report Submitted: Aug 25
Manuscript Title: Integrating Sustainability Education into Rural Tourism Development: A Conceptual Framework and Models for Agritourism and Community Growth	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 55.08.2026	
You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper is available in the “review history” of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: 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.

Questions	Rating Result
-----------	---------------

	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	4
I suggest mentioning the methodology used to obtain the information in the abstract. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	Yes
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> I suggest mentioning the methodology used to obtain the information in the abstract.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	No
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	Yes
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	Yes
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	Yes
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	Yes
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

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:	Ikram Bel Haddioui, PhD
University, Country: PhD from ENCG Settat, Morocco Working now as a professor in La Cité College, Ottawa, Canada	
Date Manuscript Received: August, 21, 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: August, 28, 2026
Manuscript Title: Integrating Sustainability Education into Rural Tourism Development: A Conceptual Framework and Models for Agritourism and Community Growth	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 55.08.2026	
You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: 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.

Questions	Rating Result
-----------	---------------

	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is fully relevant for several reasons: it explicitly shows the integration of sustainability education into rural tourism and agritourism, and the theoretical nature of the study (conceptual frameworks & models). It precisely defines the scope of application and intended local development outcomes using "Agritourism" and "Community Growth."</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4
<i>Yes, all these elements are stated clearly in the abstract</i> <i>However, the abstract doesn't specify how many sources were reviewed. What time frame? What databases or selection criteria? One sentence with approximate scope, for example: "X peer-reviewed studies from year 20XX to 20XX" would strengthen replicability and rigor.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>No significant grammatical errors or spelling mistakes were identified. The text is written in polished, coherent academic English.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The methods are clearly explained, particularly regarding the conceptual nature of the output. Some minor reservations:</i> <i>1. Even if the authors explain why hit counts were not retained, they make it harder for readers to assess how selective or comprehensive the screening process actually was. If the authors cannot give an approximate number, they can note it as a limitation.</i> <i>2. This terminology "Normalized Boolean strings" is used without full explanation of what "normalized" means in this context; a brief clarifying sentence earlier would help non-specialist readers.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The Results section is clearly written and internally consistent, with tables and figures that effectively support the narrative.</i> <i>However, the illustrative scenario (Kakheti vineyard example) represents an unusual choice that could be flagged as a clarity concern. Some readers may interpret it as an actual case study unless they read it closely. I recommend either relocating this scenario to prevent misreading.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions accurately reflect the conceptual, non-empirical nature of the study's contributions and do not overstate what the literature synthesis supports. This section could be tightened by reducing overlap with the Discussion's limitations paragraph and by more</i>	

<i>concisely emphasizing the practical implications and next steps for empirical validation in Georgia.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The reference list is comprehensive, current, and disciplinarily appropriate for an integrative review of this scope, with good transparency regarding source composition and contribution.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The main strengths of this article are its structure and methodological transparency. A few clarifications would strengthen the manuscript; I noted them at the top.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: