



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	Abstract: - Methodology. This part is not clear The author should explain where the data come from. - Results. From the beginning is a confusion between Nature Park – Carita Beach and Taman Wisata Alam – Carita Beach. Are they the same? Is one only a part of another? Another case? - Results. This phrase is confusing and it need to be redone: “Destination managers are partial and are still implementing conventional tourism as in developing countries”. Many other phrases are confusing into the article. Introduction: - Line 47. The author is asked to provide numbers to prove the affirmation of “...many domestic tourists who visited...” - Line 58-59. The author is asked to provide references to prove the affirmation of “...sustainable tourism development, has a great impact for local communities both socio-economic and cultural...” - Line 86-87. The author is asked to provide references to prove the affirmation of “Sustainable Good Governance in a destination requires a forum called Destination Management Organization (DMO).” - The introduction part is wide too general and too large for the paper, it is more a part of a lecture than an introduction into an article. It has to be re-evaluate related to relevant scientific references and according to the results and conclusions of the article. Everything else is futile. Material and Method: - There is no clear how many respondents were interviewed (and, also, a comparing with the entire statistical population. - There are no mentioned the secondary sources and why they are considered to be relevant for the research. Results: - Table 1. Neither on Methodology or on Results there is no explanation how the categories were appreciated as being weakness or Strength - Table 2. Neither on Methodology or on Results there is no explanation how the categories were appreciated as being Threat or Opportunity - The results are superficial explained and correlated with similar research and findings, so they can not be accepted as they are now Conclusion: - The conclusions are rather general and they are not correctly corrected with the results. General: - The author use many general affirmations without any references to prove them, and that is not to be accepted into a scientific article. - English language must be re-evaluated.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Keywords: keywords should not repeat any words from the title (as they help the article to be found out into databases)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Iulia C. Muresan</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Economic Sciences, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca, Romania</i>