

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_87076
Title of the Manuscript:	Green Tourism Marketing in Keranggan Village, South Tangerang, Indonesia
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>)

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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>Abstract It is recommended to rewrite the abstract and simplify it to understand it better. At the end of this abstract, please include a general conclusion of this study. In this order, it is suggested to consider a brief presentation of the study, the general aim, the followed methodology, the main results, and a general conclusion. Check the capital letters and avoid using numbers as a part of the abstract.</p> <p>Introduction Support the first paragraph with the data or opinions of the authors related to the affirmations. Many references are missing in the introduction. Complete the introduction with missing components corresponding to the research's theoretical design, such as the research question, research problem and its justification, the results obtained and value, the hypothesis or assumption, and the study's limitations, among others.</p> <p>Literature review There are many definitions and approaches regarding ecotourism; it is recommendable either to justify why this definition is assumed or to debate based on different authors. Sometimes ecotourism is used with a capital letter and others with a lowercase; it must unify the style. It is necessary to enrich the literature review because the production on the subject is proliferating; this contributes to strengthening the theoretical framework that allowed the development of this study; it is recommended to use recent sources.</p> <p>Methodology The methodological framework needs to be improved to understand better how the study was conducted and provide information to other researchers. Aspects related to methodological design are missing, such as the operationalization of variables, the presentation of instruments, and the management of qualitative data.</p> <p>Result and discussion The length of the paragraphs is very variable; in some cases, they are very short, it is recommended to enrich the ideas to complete them or look for another alternative. Definitions should be part of the literature review and, in this part, make comparisons among authors, research results, etc., comparing the results of this study with those of other researchers. It is essential to declare the theory (in the theoretical framework) with which it is possible to explain the results of this research and delve into this aspect. Epigraph 4.1.1 should provide more information and deepen the observation results and the ecotourism characteristics reflected in the photos. Must specify the aspects of the interview and the obtained results accordingly to know what was asked and the findings related to each topic. Epigraph 4.1.2 is very descriptive, and there is minimal contribution from the authors; it is suggested to compare with other similar projects, qualitatively assess the program, or other ideas that reinforce the treatment of this topic. The methodology followed for the study of Physical and Non-Physical Supporting Capacity must be specified and argued.</p> <p>Conclusion The conclusions should be reviewed and reworked in terms of findings. How they are presented refers to aspects already mentioned. Still, in this section, the new knowledge and practical solutions are expected, the corroboration of the objectives and hypotheses, the fulfillment of the proposed goal, the impact of the study's limitations, the continuity of the investigation, and the lines of future research, etc. It is advisable not to list the conclusions.</p> <p>References</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	Increase the number of bibliographic references and review the presentation following the editorial standards of this journal. In general, should review the use of the English language to improve the writing of the paper. Please, see the original manuscript with some comments	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Manuel Ramón González Herrera
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of Ciudad Juarez, Mexico