



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_30757
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDY OF SUSTAINABLE NAUTICAL ECOTOURISM MANAGEMENT ON KEPULAUAN SERIBU JAKARTA
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		
Minor REVISION comments	In this study, aims to are research for strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats; and most best management strategy for Kepulauan Seribu nautical tourism development. Within the scope of the study, internal factor: determined within SWOT analysis. The manuscript is well-established. Its language is clear and understandable. Introduction part of the study indicates the purpose, aim and the objectives of the paper. Background of the paper is adequate. "Abstract" is emphasizing the objectives and the scope of the research clearly. The article is based on a research, so it has a proper and acceptable method. Methodology is directly focused on the subject, main determinants were identified definitely, evaluation parameters were set plainly and setting the results of the research clearly. Discussion is also clear and setting the data gathered from the results of the SWOT analysis. Not all the references are typed in consistent with those formats requested by the BJAST, it is suggested that the author(s) check the references carefully and make the	First of all, I would like to say thank you for your comment. I have checked the references and the manuscript. For missing reference, I rechecked it already and fixed it. I added new references. I explained about this study influence towards ecotourism in Jakarta.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	needed corrections to fit the journal criteria. There are too many missing references Adjaye JA, Tapsuwan S. 2008; Anggraini D. 2009; Aziz A. 2003; Baksir A. 2010; Bengen DG. 2000; Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Administrasi Kepulauan Seribu. 2012; Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Administrasi Kepulauan Seribu. 2014a; Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Administrasi Kepulauan Seribu. 2014b ; BTNLKpS Balai Taman Nasional Laut Kepulauan Seribu. 2011a; BTNLKpS Balai Taman Nasional Laut Kepulauan Seribu. 2011b; BTNLKpS Balai Taman Nasional Laut Kepulauan Seribu. 2012; Clark JR. 1996; Gunn CA. 1994; Dahuri R, Rais J, Ginting, SP, Sitepu MJ. 2004; Damanik J, Weber HF. 2006 ; Hardjowigeno S, Widiatmaka. 2007; Jurado et al. 2011; Kartika T, Harini S, Asriningrum W. 2011; Laboratorium Penginderaan Jauh dan Kartografi. 2005; Panuju DR, Rustiadi E. 2012; Pemerintah Republik Indonesia. 2005, Pemerintah Republik Indonesia. 2007; Pemerintah Republik Indonesia. 2014; Pemerintah Provinsi Daerah Khusus Ibukota Jakarta. 2014; Razak A, Suprihardjo R. 2013; Rustiadi E, Saefulhakim S, Panuju DR. 2011; Salm RV, Clark JR, Siirila E. 2000; Sitorus, S.R.P. 2004; Kepulauan Seribu. 2013; Tar H. 2010; Triono. 2013; Widiatmaka. 2013; Wong PP. 1998; Yuanike, 2003 don't exist in manuscript. Badiyah, 2004; doesn't exist in references. The discussion is good but the contributions should be clearly stated and more detailed in the conclusion section. Author (s) should be more explicit about how the results of this study influence promoting ecotourism in this	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Jakarta area. The article is an original paper the results of a research. The subject is original and relevant for the journal which also compromises interesting data for the reader.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>