Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJARR_97957**
Title of the Manuscript:	**THE STRATEGY FOR THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DIVING ECOTOURISM MANAGEMENT IN THE CONSERVATION AREA OF THE DAMPIER STRAIT WATERS, RAJA AMPAT**
Type of the Article	**Research 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:
(https://www.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy)

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. **Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. **Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** 4. **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** 5. **Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** 6. **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**Yes, it is interesting and significant** **Yes, Suitable** The abstract is clear and comprehensive. The research objective could be clearly defined in the Introduction section. Yes it is scientifically logical and well put. References are sufficient. Only question is why the research of 2016-17 is presented so late and no recent data is presented.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	English is good and article is well presented. There are one or two grammatical/typing errors to be rectified.	
Optional/General comments	Good work and needs just justification of lack of recent data.	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Sandilyan Ramanujam Pagaldiviti**
Department, University & Country	**C V Raman Global University, India**