

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_100468
Title of the Manuscript:	Community Based Sustainable Tourism and Its Impact on Socio-Economic Development of Phobjikha Valley
Type of the Article	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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The paper contains too much information. It should be less and more comprehensive. The paper should have the following chapters: Abstract, Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, The Study's Findings, Discussion and Conclusion, The Study's Limitations and Suggestion for Future Researches. Also, the abstract should not contain abbreviations. In the text, the authors at the beginning should mention the words and then the abbreviations in the rest of the paper. The paper has positive issues, such as the methodology used and should be rewritten by the authors.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No, it contains abbreviations and long sentences.</p> <p>No the majority of them are not needed.</p> <p>The paper is scientifically correct but should become shorter and more comprehensive.</p> <p>There are adequate number of references and recent ones.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The authors should read 1-2 relevant papers and based on them (the presentation of them) to rewrite the current paper.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Konstantinos Malagas
Department, University & Country	University of the Aegean, Greece