

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58790

Title: Economic Multipliers, Spatial Transformations, and Sustainable Policy Frameworks in India's Sacred and Wellness Tourism Economy: A Systematic Literature Synthesis and Case-Based Analysis

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision ...YES.....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			YES	
Techn. Quality				YES
Clarity			YES	
Significance		YES		

Reviewer's ID: JPR-205

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The manuscript addresses a relevant and significant area of research by examining the economic and socio-cultural dimensions of religious tourism and pilgrimage destinations in India. The comparative discussion of major destinations provides useful insights into issues such as employment generation, local entrepreneurship, infrastructure development, visitor management, and sustainability. The manuscript also brings together perspectives from tourism, economics, culture, and destination management, which gives it practical relevance. The extensive engagement with previous literature is a positive feature, and the policy-oriented discussion has the potential to make the study useful for tourism planners and destination managers.

However, I recommend that the manuscript be considered after major revision. The main concern is the methodological rigor and clarity of the literature synthesis. Although the paper refers to a systematic review of a large body of studies, the process used to identify, screen, select, and analyse the literature needs to be explained much more clearly. The basis for selecting the destinations and studies should also be justified, and the distinction between evidence from previous studies and the authors' own

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

synthesis should be clarified. Some sections are repetitive and predominantly descriptive, while the research gap and the manuscript's specific original contribution need to be stated more explicitly. The extensive reference list also requires careful checking for consistency and relevance. Addressing these issues, tightening the language, and strengthening the analytical discussion would considerably improve the academic quality and credibility of the manuscript. Therefore, in its present form, I would recommend Accept after Major Revision.