

Authors' response to reviewers' comments

Dear Editor in Chief and all reviewers,

Thank you for giving us opportunity to submit a revised draft of our manuscript and also for a good news that this article will be accepted after minor revision. We deliver big appreciation for the time and effort that you and the reviewers have dedicated to provide your valuable feedback on our manuscript. We are grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on our paper. We fully considered and dealt with all of them. We have been able to incorporate changes to reflect most of the suggestions provided by the reviewers. In addition to dealing with all of the comments below, the current version of this manuscript has been checked and updated. We hope all issues have been fully dealt with. Once again, many thanks for your kind supports to improve the quality of our manuscript. Here is a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments and concerns.

Response to Reviewer #5

Comment #1:

The author needs to include some empirical evidence (facts and figures) in introduction section to support and justify the issue of this study.

Response #1:

Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have revised the 'introduction' section. We put some additional empirical evidence by modifying sentences that are on second paragraph, become as follows:

"Nusa Penida island in Bali Province has been designated as Marine Protected Area by local Klungkung regency in 2010 (Daulat et al 2018). The measure was supported by the Ministry of Fisheries and Marine affairs as an effort to protect mangrove forest in the area from anthropogenic pressures and other source of mangrove degradation. Mangrove forest in this island is mostly concentrated in Jungutbatu Village of Nusa Penida islands covering an area of 194 hectares. The mangrove forest is known for its pristine environment and attract tourists to visit the area. Based on survey conducted by Tania and Muljadi (2011), the number of foreign tourists visiting Nusa Penida reached 200,000 people per year. This provide an opportunity to develop and manage the mangrove area as eco-tourism area, so that the conservation and economic purposes of the mangrove management could be achieved."

Comment #2:

Motivation towards the topic/issue is not enough. The study needs to embrace more theoretical evidences in introduction section to elaborate the statement of the problem.

Response #2:

Thank you for suggesting us to strengthening the motivation toward the topic. We have added sentences on third paragraph line 10-12 to elaborate the statement of the problem as follows

“Unfortunately, mangrove ecosystems in Nusa Penida have not been managed as tourist destinations, so that it is necessary to study the condition of various aspect related to suitability, carrying capacity and priority strategy.”

Comment #3:

Mention the source of the methodology used in table 1.

Response #3:

Thank you for your comments. Therefore, as suggested by the reviewer, we have revised and put source of methodology used in table1.

Comment #4:

The methodologies and their constructed values in table 1 and 2 need more explanations/interpretations.

Response #4:

Thank you for your suggestion. As suggested by the reviewer, we have explained and given more interpretations in result and discussion, such as:

“The carrying capacity arrangement was intended to maintain the authenticity and sacredness of Nusa Penida. Exceeding the carrying capacity tend to cause congestion which reduces the comfort of tourist. The most important in mangrove tourism development is facilities, activities and wildlife. Therefore, the comfort factor should be maintain.”