



SDI Review Form 1.6

1.

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_45532
Title of the Manuscript:	Carrying Capacity of Betawi Setu Babakan Cultural Tourism Area A Case Study in South Jakarta, Indonesia
Type of the Article	Original Research Papers

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	1. Background On p.1-2: Why the author(s) selected in the Setu Babakan Betawi cultural tourism area, a region in the Jakarta of Indonesia as the research object? This should be elaborated. On p.1, line 1: "cultural heritage"? What this word means? World cultural heritage of UNESCO? Indonesia cultural heritage ? There is no cleared explanation. On p.1, line 5: What do author(s) mean by "Carrying Capacity?" this needs to be better clarified. On p.2, line 10-12: It's mentioned that "Tourism carrying capacity was the main factor that determined the level of tourist visits." I'd like more clarity in what author(s) have said here. Who says this? 2. Literature Review On p.2-6: The existing articles reviewed in this manuscript are not very updated. Amongst all articles reviewed the ones published after 2010 is no more than 10. It is suggested to include more recent published articles if possible. On p.2, line 15-18: It's mentioned that "according to Law No. 10 of 2009 concerning Tourism, is a travelling activity carried out by a person or a group of people by visiting certain places for recreational purposes, personal development or studying the uniqueness of tourist attractions that are visited in a period of time." I'd like more clarity in what author(s) have said here by literature review. On p.2, line 27: Muljadi (2010:7) should be collect to (Muljadi & Warman, 2010: 7). On p.3, line 13-16: It's mentioned that "According to Law No. 10 of 2009 concerning Tourism, Article 1 paragraph 5, Tourism Objects or Tourism Attractions are things that have uniqueness, ..." I'd like more clarity in what author(s) have said here. Who says this? On P. 3, line 23: Yoeti (2008: 177) not listed in Reference Section. On P. 4, line 17: Sunaryo (2013: 173) not listed in Reference Section. On p.2-6: Author(s) need a more deep analysis of the literature in relevant journals, where this topic has been analyzed, especially in the cultural heritage in carrying capacity, tourism/tourism object, cultural tourism; community-based tourism literature review is too old or missed. It is suggested to include more recent published articles. On p.2-6: At the end of the literature review, there should be a short section outlining what the gap in the research is and how this research contributes. On p.2-6: Most references used are dated. Almost no references published after 2014. 3. Research Method On p.6: In the research method section, the author(s) should have provided more background information of the methods they used. On p.6: At the start of section methodology, there should be an introductory sentence explaining the purpose of the analysis. What is it trying to achieve? On P. 6, line 9: What does "the Slovin formula" mean from research method? What is it trying to achieve? On P. 6, line 14: What does "focus group discution (FGD)" mean from research method? What is it trying to achieve? The FGD needs more explanation. Who are these people (job titles)? How were they recruited? What were they asked? On P. 6, line 15-16: What does "multidementing scaling (MDS)" mean from research method? What is it trying to achieve? On P. 6, line 17-18: It's mentioned that "The indicators/dimensions studied were the attractions (attractiveness and uniqueness), accessibility, facilities and community involvement." This needs explanation. Where do the indicators/dimensions come from?	1. Background - Setu Babakan has been designated as a Betawi cultural preserve area and tourist destination by the DKI Jakarta government for more than 15 years, but has a low level of tourist visits. - The Cultural Heritage here means Betawi cultural reserve area, an area established by the DKI Jakarta government as a place to preserve Betawi culture. - Carrying capacity (Revised) - Revised, the source of the quote is included. 2. Literature Review - Literature has been added to the publication after 2010, but there are still some literature that uses publications below 2010. - Quoted directly from the law which is Law No. 10 of 2009 concerning tourism. The law is used as a reference because it contains various definitions and rules that are used as the basis for developing tourism in Indonesia. - Revised - Revised - It has been added to the literature on cultural heritage. - Revised - Added gaps and contributions. - Added new literature. 3. Research Method - Revised - Revised - Slovin formula is chosen as a technique for determining sample size due to large population numbers. - The function of the FGD in this study was to support the research findings. Those involved in the FGD were Setu Babakan tourism area management, the community, traders and the Betawi cultural community (involved in Setu Babakan tourism development). The FGD material discussed the research findings and their role in developing Setu Babakan tourism area. - MDS function is to identify key dimensions of evaluation of Setu Babakan tourism objects and obtain spatial maps that represent tourists' perceptions and preferences. - Indicators taken from literature, the research team discussed with Setu Babakan tourism area management. - Revised - Revised References - Revised - Revised - Revised



SDI Review Form 1.6

	On P. 6: Somehow the hypotheses proposed are not developed based on strong theoretical discussions. On p. 6: This study the author(s) does not make a strong theoretical contribution to the body of knowledge. References About the references style section, I had some questions in according with authors-instruction: On p.14: "Muljadi AJ, Warman Adri, 2010, Kepariwisata dan Perjalanan, Jakarta, Raja Grafindo Persada." should be collect to "Muljadi AJ, Warman A. Kepariwisata dan Perjalanan, Jakarta, Raja Grafindo Persada. 2010. On p.14, line 24-25: "Suwena, Widyatmaja, 2010. Pengetahuan Dasar Ilmu Pariwisata. Denpasar :Udayana University Press. 2010." There is first name are missed. On p.13-14: All references style is same problem.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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>

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	