



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_42338
Title of the Manuscript:	THE COMMUNICATION OF BALI TOURISM ACCORDING TO BUREAUCRATS AND INTELLECTUALS IN MAINTAINING THE SUSTAINABILITY OF TRI HITA KARANA INSIGHT
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	Dear author(s), Good day. I found this article has some merits. However, this article is too long and perhaps paved a way to lost my focus. There are several suggestions have been put forward to enhance the quality of the article as follows: 1. Some words in Bahasa Indonesia should be translated into English such as 'adat' and so on. Lacking I'm a Malaysian then I knew these words and how other international readers? 2. I rarely found related articles on 'Tri Hita Karana' in the context of tourism, If got any place them in LR section. 3. The theory part seems not strong and very descriptive. I would suggest that just synthesise the main ideas of relevant literature and compare to your study. 4. Do not simply write the full article reference in the middle of article for instance in Line 133, 163 and 178. These should be appeared in the reference list. 5. Source for Berger and Luckmann, year? 6. Error or repeated word found in Line 182 and 183. 7. Sources found in-text should follow the standard referencing style. 8. Why too many theories applied in this study? Justify? Why don't use one theory and link to the subject? 9. Line 243, got something missing here? 10. Line 321 source since this is very strong statement. 11. What is your implications of the study? To academia? To policy makers? 12. This manuscript should send to professional proofreading for further enhancement. 13. References should follow the format given by the journal.	1. Already done. 2. Already added two articles to change the previous. 3. It has been focused on the Social Construction of Reality as the essence of inspiration of this research. 4. Already done suitable to reviewer instruction. 5. It had been put. 6. It had been revised. 7. Already done. 8. Finally, the author select one theory only. 9. It had been replaced. 10. It had been replaced. 11. It is sure to policy makers, had been completed. 12. The author had been submitted to promoter and co promoter to review it. 13. Already done.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		