



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_59326
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic Valuation of Santolo Beach Tourism in Garut Regency West Java
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:

(<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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Table 1 not properly designed. It is confusing. It needs to be restructured.</li> <li>2. The economic values could be in crore or lakhs form so as to enable the readers' minds to register the findings of the research.</li> <li>3. English usage and grammar errors are endemic and require substantial copy-editing.</li> <li>4. Abbreviations like IDR has to be expanded and given space in between to understand the values properly to avoid confusion.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Presentation of equation needs to be clearer in 3.1 and 3.2.2.</li> <li>2. Spelling error of "percentage" in Table 3.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Statistical analysis is a must for this paper and as such appropriate analysis has been carried out.</li> <li>2. Data seems to be controlled.</li> <li>3. The discussion part does not focus depth in the study with suitable references.</li> <li>4. Authors must have stated the objectives of the research study so that their final result and conclusion could be justified.</li> <li>5. Sufficient references has been cited.</li> <li>6. Conclusions is supported by data and seems unbiased.</li> <li>7. Instead of taking education as a variable, the author could have considered age and income as the research topic is related to tourism which has more significance to age as compared to education.</li> </ol>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Bhuvana Venkatraman</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Guru Ghasidas University, India</i></b>