

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_96849
Title of the Manuscript:	SUSTAINABLE TOURISM ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - EXPERIENCE IN THE WORLD AND PRACTICE IN VIETNAM
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> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. In the research conclusion, the sustainable tourism development model didn't not be explained according to the problems faced, so this manuscript doesn't have the important implications for scientific and community.</p> <p>2. Yes,it is.</p> <p>3. The abstract didn't explain the research objectives, research gap, methods used, conclusions, and policy implications. So the abstract of this article is not comprehensive.</p> <p>4. No, they aren't. This article didn't write down research gap, research objectives, and methode used. The separation between introduction and discussion also is not clear. Research conclusion is too short, hasn't concluded the existing problems yet.</p> <p>5. No, I don't.</p> <p>6. This authors didn't write down the references they cited at the end of each paragraph that are not their findings.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Check the gramaticall	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Major Revisions</p> <p>1. Please, explain your research objectives, methods used, conclusions, and policy implications.</p> <p>2. You shouldn't repeat the same words in the "keywords".</p> <p>3. Please, write down the references you cited at the end of each paragraph that are not your findings.</p> <p>4. Please, write down your research gap, and research objectives in the introduction.</p> <p>5. The separation between introduction and discussion is not clear. Research conclusion is too short, hasn't concluded the existing problems yet.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hani Ernawati</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ambarukmo Tourism High School, Indonesia</b>