

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_79422
Title of the Manuscript:	Residents' Perception towards Beach Tourism Development in Sri Lanka
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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>First of all, I am glad to have the opportunity to read the article on "Residents' Perception towards Beach Tourism Development in Sri Lanka". I would like to say that the topic of this paper is relevant, but from my humble point of view, the paper should be improved in the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The authors should state in the abstract that the valid answers have been 400 and not confuse saying that they have selected 467 residents. 2) The manuscript needs (in all the sections) a thorough review of the current literature on the investigated topic. The authors do not offer in all the research any reference in the last 4 years. For this reason alone, the article should be rejected, but I think that if the authors do a correct job of searching the bibliography, the article could be evaluated again for its acceptance. 3) Could the authors better describe how the sampling process was done? 4) Could the authors explain if the sample is representative of the investigated population? 5) There should be a specific section where the implications of the research for academia, management and for society are discussed. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Why is there a 2.1 if there is no point 2.2? 2) I would recommend including in the text a figure of the model raised at the end of point 2 (LITERATURE REVIEW). 3) Authors should do a proofreading of the English, perhaps providing a certificate that a proofreading by a professional editor has taken place. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Figure 1 is not seen correctly. I recommend reagan the figure to make it look good 	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Pedro Cuesta-Valiño
Department, University & Country	University of Alcalá, Spain