

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_95290
Title of the Manuscript:	“Comparative analysis of the activities and performance of BTB with other NTO of South Asian countries”
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is scientifically rich. However, this is not a comparative study. This study is country specific with focus on Bangladesh. I suggest the topic be: "An analysis of the activities and performance of Bangladesh Tourism Board (BTB)" 2. The title should not have abbreviation. BTB & NTO should be written in full 3. Similarly, abbreviations should be stated in full at first mention even if it comes first in the abstract. So should be BTB and NTO and GDP. 4. The authors state that it is a comparative study, but the abstract and key words suggest something else. If Bangladesh is the yardstick of the comparison, then it should be stated in the abstract. Or the Author must explain why Bangladesh is single out in the abstract and keys words out of all South Asian countries. 5. line 4 of paragraph one, the statement "by heart and soul" is not academic and must be rephrased. E.g strive 6. GPD in first paragraph....should be GDP and must be written in full since it's the first mention in the text. 7. Paragraph one is too long, must at least be split into two. 8. In paragraph two, the authors are already providing/suggesting policies to improve tourist arrivals in Bangladesh after just comparing tourist arrival for 2 years and by 2 other countries. Comparison needs to be extending to more years and made in relation to many other South Asian countries. The authors should also identify and state empirical challenges faced by the tourism industry in Bangladesh before they can make policy recommendations. In short, It is too early at that stage to suggest policies. 8. The last 6 sentences of paragraph 3 is full of claims (the board is doing.../ other countries are doing...). Citations must be provided to tell readers how the authors came to know about the activities Bangladesh tourism board and other countries' tourism boards. 9. "1.1 Objectives of the study" It is no advisable to number sections of the introductory chapter as if it is a dissertation of thesis. This section 1.1 should just be written as a paragraph and the objectives should not be written as bullet points. 10. The paragraph that explains the objectives of the study should be followed by a paragraph that details how the rest of the study is arranged or organized. It should tell readers what is in section 2, 3, 4 and 5. 11. Paragraph one state the key worlds in full, e.g Bangladesh Tourism Board (BTB), National Tourism Organization (NTO), and National Tourism Board (NTB). This paragraph should be clear about these terms and abbreviations. Besides, these should have come out clear in the title/abstract/introduction 14. TOAB, PATA, DMO, MATI Should be in full with abbreviations in Brackets since it's a first mention in the paper. 15. In section 3, it is not applicable in a publishable manuscript to put research design, data collection methods....as separate sections. These should just be paragraphs on the heading of methodology of the study. I advise you remove 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5. Just write as consecutive paragraphs as this is not a dissertation/thesis. 16. Section 4 and its sub-sections are fine. However, this should come as section 2, followed by section 1 which is the introduction. It is Section 2 which will help readers to have a clear overview of the research study area and its ambitions. Normally section 3 (Methodology of the study) must be followed by results/Analysis/discussion. 17. Section 5 (Discussion and Analysis) should be "Analysis and Discussion". First you analyse 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>your study collected data. And then you discuss your analysis in line with the findings of other studies who did a similar study in Asia and beyond.</p> <p>18. In section 5, the discussion should be enriched with the findings of other studies (Similar to..., Contrary to...).</p> <p>19. Section 6 (Conclusion) confirms to me that this is not a comparative study as indicated by the authors in the title and abstract.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The paper has some grammatical and typographical errors. I advise it undergoes free Grammarly editing. https://www.grammarly.com/	
Optional/General comments	I am convinced the author(s) did some substantial amount of work and reading of literature. With re-organization as suggested above, this can make a very good piece of work. If it was a dissertation, I would give the candidate a passing mark of 80%	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lloyd George Banda
Department, University & Country	School of Law, Economics and Governance, University of Malawi, Malawi