

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_127480
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPLEMENTATION OF REGIONAL REGULATION NUMBER 11 OF 2016 CONCERNING DEVELOPMENT MASTERPLAN REGIONAL TOURISM
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript claims to use a qualitative approach but does not provide enough details regarding the methodology to justify this approach. While interviews and observations are mentioned, there is no clear explanation of how data were collected, analysed, and validated. The paper lacks sufficient methodological rigor expected from qualitative studies, such as in-depth descriptions of the sampling strategy or the reasoning behind selecting specific informants. It also lacks details on how data triangulation was achieved, which is crucial for qualitative research. Additionally, more attention should be given to the long-term impacts of the implementation beyond the immediate scope of the research. The manuscript also does not engage deeply with the potential biases introduced by relying on qualitative data collection, nor does it discuss how the research accounted for them.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is relevant but could be more specific by reflecting the qualitative focus. A possible suggestion: "A Qualitative Assessment of the Implementation of Regional Regulation Number 11 of 2016 for Regional Tourism Development in Gorontalo."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract needs revisions. While it summarizes the key outcomes, it does not clarify the methodological approach or the limitations of the study. The implications of the findings should be connected to the qualitative research process and discussed more critically.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is generally clear, but there are gaps in the "Methods" section that make it difficult to assess the validity of the findings. Subsections related to data analysis, especially with qualitative methods, are necessary and currently missing.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The absence of detailed qualitative data analysis undermines the credibility of the findings. The reliance on interviews and observations is typical for qualitative studies, but without transparency in the analysis, it is hard to verify the accuracy of the conclusions. Moreover, the article does not fully address how data saturation was achieved or what steps were taken to ensure rigor in the qualitative analysis, such as coding frameworks or the use of software for thematic analysis.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are relatively sufficient but outdated in the context of tourism and qualitative research. More recent works on qualitative methodologies and tourism development policies would add depth to the discussion.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is readable but needs refinement. Some sentences are verbose and convoluted, which impacts the clarity of the arguments. Grammatical errors also need to be corrected for better scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	The article discusses an important regional tourism issue, but the research would benefit greatly from stronger methodological transparency and a critical examination of its limitations. The manuscript needs a more thorough discussion on how qualitative data were handled and how the findings contribute to the broader literature on tourism development policies.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Azim Salahi Kojour
Department, University & Country	Shafagh Tonekabon Institute of Higher Education, Iran