



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_48937
Title of the Manuscript:	Evolution of Tourism Policies due to Change of Ruling Parties 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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The method used is not described in the abstract. Methods and techniques used should briefly describe in the abstract. 2. The main findings of the research are not stated in the abstract. <p>Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Please check the style of in-text citation used in the article. 2- Refer to line 12, 13, 15 and 18; the authors(s) used IEEE citation style by inserting number citations consecutively within brackets [1]....[2]....[3]. 3- Refer to line 15: the author(s) used APA style in-text citation by inserting author-date style (Richter & Richter, 1985) 4- Please standardize the in-text citation style by referring to the journal template. <p>Sob-Topic No 2, No 3, No 4, No 5:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The authors did not cite any sources along the discussions. Authors should revise the discussions and cite the sources. 2- Maybe some people say that they do not have to cite the source when the information they include is common knowledge. But in this context (Sub Topic No 2- No 5), the information given are based on historical literature and are not something common or most people know. <p>General Comment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- This paper is not an empirical paper and maybe we can categorize it under historical review types of paper. 2- As this is not empirical paper, the discussions need to add more literature to support the findings/discussions. 3- Literature review should include recent studies (5 recent years). Be up to date but do not forget the older studies. 4- To produce a good paper, four (4) list of references is definitely not sufficient. 	<p>Abstract: 1.2. revised</p> <p>General Comment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.this study is review paper 2. revised 3. revised 4. revised
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	