

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_99512
Title of the Manuscript:	THE DEVELOPMENT MODEL OF ECOTOURISM MANAGEMENT IN GUNUNG BOTAK, THE SOUTH OF MANOKWARI REGENCY, WEST PAPUA PROVINCE
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.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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is important for the scientific and tourism research world that helps as case study reference. It can help researchers of new ecotourism destinations as baseline. We know that the ecotourism destinations need destination specific management model, this can be used as one case study.</p> <p>Yes, the title is suitable and it is in line with its body.</p> <p>The Abstract is more or less comprehensive for explorative research work.</p> <p>The subsections are coherent and consistent. I don't observe any inappropriateness.</p> <p>It follows research work process. Therefore, it is scientifically correct.</p> <p>I think the references are enough but some references are not included in citation.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>There are few punctuation and grammar problems but it is ok.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The research is reviewing and explorative assessment so that it can be considered comprehensive for publication.</p>	

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:	Teklebrhan Legese Gebreyesus
Department, University & Country	Aksum University, Ethiopia