



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_60402
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study of Tourism Development Influence on QOL of Alishan Indigenous Tribes in Taiwan
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/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	In the part of result and discussion section (p.4-6), It only shows the result of the research itself and there is no discussion point. In fact, the discussion point or section play important point research. This discussion must cover the results of the research itself, the other relevant results of the researches, and the related literature review. It must be developed by comparison and contrast organization of the three domains.	
Minor REVISION comments	Quality of Life (QOL) should be written/abbreviated (QoF). The sampling design should be purposive random sampling (abstract) The phrase of "research subject and sampling" seems to be ambiguous. Research subject refers to informant and the sampling means the way how to determine the informants (p.3). The data analysis refer to the way or technique how the data are analyzed. In this article, the data are analyzed by One-way ANOVA statistical. And SPSS for Windows 22.0 is only a media (aid) in order to do Anova analysis by computer rather than conventional calculation (p.3). So it must be clearly stated that the data are analyzed by ANOVA. For reliability and validity of the questionnaire instead of stating "three scholars and experts in this field are invited to examine whether the translation scale of this study is the same as the original meaning." It should be stated that the validity and reliability of the questionnaire is done by triangulation judgment (p.3). The conclusion should be line with the problem(s) and or the purposes of the research. In this article there are two problems and purposes, so the conclusion should refer to the number of problems and purpose. Then, the suggestion also should be better to refer to the conclusion.	
Optional/General comments	Generally, this article makes sense.	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>I Wy. Dirgeyasa</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>State University of Medan, Indonesia</i>