

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_SAJSE_128054 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | POLICY REVIEW ON LAND USE PLANNING IN THE SHORELINE AREAS OF LAKE TOBA: POTENTIAL FOR ECOTOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN MUARA DISTRICT, NORTH TAPANULI REGENCY |
| Type of the Article | |

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | It is interesting and actual topic, since natural and cultural heritage are in scope of tourist interest, tourism may give needed injection for sustainable development, but may be very harmful in the protected areas if it is not treated properly. All case studies, different approaches and mythologies as well as suggested masseurs all over the world are welcomed. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes, but maybe too long. I suggest: POLICY REVIEW ON LAND USE PLANNING AND POTENTIAL FOR ECOTOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN THE SHORELINE AREAS OF LAKE TOBA IN MUARA DISTRICT, NORTH TAPANULI REGENCY Location is explained in the Abstract. | |
| 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. | Yes | |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | I miss one important part, more comprehensive literature/references review, especially this topic was researched on other case studies/polices/measures. It should be after introduction, not briefly in this part. This will implicate much longer reference list (next comment). Secondly, this review will contribute to creation of the section of Discussion, were Autor(s) could explain differences or similarities in methodology, suggested measures etc. leading to the final conclusions and explanation what differs their paper and research, and makes it unique and scientifically relevant. Methodology is well explained, just add this literature review as primary step. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The reference list is very short, mostly based on references regarding the study area. | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | It could be approved by final proof reading. | |
| Optional/General comments | The majority of the text is in listing form, it is easy to review, but scientific paper demand more textual explanations and discussions. Since paper mentioned results of interviews conducted with key stakeholders, there should be attached approval of the relevant Ethical committee, with statement that research was conducted and results are protected and kept on the proper way. | |

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: | Natasa Danilovic Hristic |
| Department, University & Country | Institute of Architecture and Urban & Spatial Planning of Serbia, Serbia |