



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_38298
Title of the Manuscript:	Residents' Perceived Marine Tourism Impacts and Support Development Attitude - Case Study of Jibei Island
Type of the Article	

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: in the abstract should be mention also what analysis method was used. The results should not be numbered, but presented generally. Introduction and literature review requires minor revision. The authors should refer also to more recent researches. The objectives of the research are not very clear presented. Methodology: Line 190: "The method of investigation is the researcher from the beginning of the port" for me is not clear what the authors mean, please review. 3.3 Questionnaire Design: "The scale mainly refers to Baysan (2001), while the study refers to Yoon, Gursay, and Chen (2001) for tourism's impact on marine research and refers to Andereck, Valentine, Knopf, and Vogt (2005) for tourism impact on the destination questionnaires." – please review is confusing. Factor analysis: why just for the second factor is mention the Cronbach alpha coefficient? There should be presented a comparative analysis of the factors with other similar research (island tourism and not only). Discussions: lines 353-356 are general statements without any references, please check it and add some references to sustain your statement. Lines 404-406 should be rephrased or moved to literature review section, as it is now. Lines 408-410 you should underline how the research support the social exchange theory, is not clear and it seems the sentence is not finished. Conclusions: they are poor. The authors should underline how the objectives of the research were achieved, and which are the limitations of the study. References: the authors should refer also to more recent research regarding the sustainable tourism development and residents' support for tourism development. Most of the references are before 2010.	
Minor REVISION comments	English should be review.	
Optional/General comments	The paper presents an interesting topic, and can be very useful for scholars and future researches. I congratulate the authors and wish them good luck in the final process of editing the paper .	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lulia Cristina Muresan
Department, University & Country	Department of Economic Sciences, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca, Romania