

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_129737
Title of the Manuscript:	Land Use Analysis of Lake Toba's Lakeside Area in Toba Regency Before and After Geopark Designation
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.	This study offers valuable insights and can serve as a model for other regions worldwide. The findings of this research contribute to and reinforce the global geopark movement. The enhancement of water quality following the Geopark designation is a highly positive and noteworthy outcome.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The Impact of Geopark Establishment on Environmental Sustainability: A Case Study of Land Use Analysis in the Lake Toba Lakeside Region	
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 manuscript should be revised by the authors in accordance with the reviewers' comments, addressing all feedback provided throughout the entire document. And then they can rewrite a new revised abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>Apart from the changes in water quality, the other changes in the area are imprecise and remain vague and overly generalized.</p> <p>You should show exactly what changes have occurred in the geopark area (quantitatively) in the last three years (apart from water quality) and if the conditions of specific geological phenomena in terms of use and reduction of destruction have improved according to your observations, bring it in the article.</p> <p>You need to produce new maps yourself! Specifically, the discussion does not adequately align with the findings. From a social perspective, what was the foundation of your study? Are the statements you have made regarding the improvement of the local community's situation based on specific research findings, and if so, what sources are you referencing? Did your research include conducting interviews with local residents or experts to gather this information?</p> <p>The Map No. 5 lacks clarity.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Certain sources cited in the text, such as Farsani and Dowling, are missing from the references section. Additionally, claims attributed to sources like Novelli (2018) do not align with my understanding of their work. Furthermore, your findings regarding the strengthening of geoparks align closely with the arguments presented in Chapter 1 of the book <i>Geotourism Industry in the 21st Century</i> .	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	In my view, providing a single map that clearly displays the before-and-after scenarios, along with the exact boundaries of the geopark and lake, would be sufficient. To accurately capture changes within the local community, it is essential to conduct interviews with experts or local residents.	

Review Form 3

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:	Bahram Nekouie Sadry
Department, University & Country	University of Science and Culture, Iran