



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_37019
Title of the Manuscript:	Review of Sustainable Good Governance in Nature Park – Carita Beach
Type of the Article	Review Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Dear author(s), After I reviewed this paper I found that this paper has some merits. However, several questions were raised and suggestions were provided in order to enhance the quality of the paper as follows: 1. I do not think that this paper is fully considered as 'review paper' where the authors included some empirical findings which are derived from primary data. Thus, please 'delete' the word 'review' in the title. 2. It is less clear why Sustainable Good Governance system is required in Nature Park-Carita Beach? Are they any current problems tarnishing the potentials? 3. Justify your problem statement clearly. 4. Source for Figure 1? 5. Are exploratory and explanatory approaches can be included in single study? Justify it? 6. Line 233, change the Literature Studies to 'Literature Reviews'. 7. Justify why Qualitative research approach is most relevant for this study? 8. Does this study free from reliability and validity issues? 9. Source for Table 1 and 2? 10. Major proofreading is required to avoid potentials misleading sentences. Best wishes,	1. Title: Sustainable Good Governance in Nature Park – Carita Beach 2. A study on Sustainable Good Governance is required because the successful of sustainable tourism in Carita beach will only succeed if managed with Governance. Tourism is always includes many stakeholders. Differences of interest, skill, awareness and knowledge from these various stakeholders will result interaction and different level of engagement from various stakeholder for each destination. With such background, good governance is required that can accommodate collaborative forum where competency of each individual and institution/organization of stakeholders can be unified to produce synergy and better output instead of working alone on its own. 3. Main issue in Carita Beach, stakeholder's concern towards sustainable tourism is low especially the local government where the local government is still putting forward economic issue but putting aside environmental and cultural aspect. For example the local government have not made a policy on zone separation for fishing areas/fish auction and tourism. Consequently there is a pollution of sea water caused by fishing activity and fish auction this has an impact on tourism aspect. 4. Source Figure 1: Process by researcher for this study. 5. The approach conducted only explanatory approach. 6. Done 7. Qualitative approach is used to explore the problem in sustainable tourism holistically so the researchers able to establish his study not only base on variable but the study on overall social situation on Carita Beach Nature Park. 8. The validity test of the data for this study includes credibility test, transferability test, dependability test, and confirmability test). (a) Test the credibility of the data Test the credibility of the data is done through (1) extension of observation, return to object of study, make observations and conduct interviews with previous participants or new participants (2) increased perseverance, with more careful and continuous observation. With this method data certainty and sequence of events can be recorded accurate and systematically (3) triangulation, in this test it means checking the data from various source with various way and time. So that there is a triangulation of source, triangulation of data collection techniques and time (4) Negative case analysis, is a case that is not appropriate or different from the results of research to at a certain time, means researchers looking for data that is different or even contrary to the data that has been found. If there is no data that is different or contrary to the findings, then the data found can be trusted. But if researchers still get data that conflict with the data found, then researchers may be will change the findings. (b) Transferability test This test shows the degree of accuracy or the applicability of the result of this study to the population where the sample was taken. Therefore, so other people can understand the result of this study and applicable, the researcher in making his report has to provide the detail description, clear, systematic and can be trusted. Therefore the readers are understand the result of this study, so



SDI Review Form 1.6

		that they can decide if they want to apply the result or not in other destination across Indonesia. (c) <i>Dependability test</i> For this test of <i>dependability</i>, researcher has to be able to demonstrate to the audit team how he start in identify the problem, enter the field and determine the data source, data analysis, performing validity test, up to making conclusion. (d) <i>Confirmability test</i> The research is said to be confirmed if it has been agreed by many people so the test can be conducted in the same time. The researcher is using the <i>Focus Discussion Group</i> (FGD) facility to do it. To test the <i>confirmability test</i>, test the results of the study associated with the research process undertaken. If the study results is a function of the research process undertaken, then the research has met the standard of confirmability. 9. Source Table t and 2: Process by researcher for this study 10. Done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		