



Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism (JEMT)

eISSN: 2068-7729

Journal DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt>

Review Form for Manuscript ID _____
JEMT, Volume _____, Issue _____, _____

Manuscript ID:
Title of the Manuscript:

Date of Receipt of the Manuscript for Review: _____
Due Date for Review (no more than 6 weeks from Date of Receipt): _____

Overall Evaluation form

	Explanation	Evaluation 1 – 10 points
1.	The title is clear and reflects the object of study.	
2.	The abstract synthesizes well the content of the article.	
3.	The introduction presents the relevance of the article for the given field and quotes the main results obtained by other authors concerning the subject.	
4.	The article contains a good overview on the previous studies from the same domain.	
5.	The methodology in use is coherently presented and there is a fair justification of it being preferred instead of other existent methodologies.	
6.	The source of the database is reliable (official databases, representative samples, etc.).	
7.	The scientific contribution of the paper is original for the economic theory or practice.	
8.	The conclusions summarize clearly the results and the consequences.	
9.	Recent and well chosen (suitable) bibliography. There is a clear match between the bibliographic references from the end of the article and the ones quoted in the text.	
10.	The vocabulary used is academic, without incoherencies or grammar mistakes.	
Total:		

Rating the Manuscript:

	Criteria	Explanation	Evaluation 1 – 10 points
11.	Novelty	Is the question original and well-defined?	
		Do the results provide an advancement of the current knowledge?	
12.	Scope	Does the work fit the journal aims and scope?	
13.	Significance	Are the results interpreted appropriately?	
		Are they significant?	
		Are all conclusions justified and supported by the results?	
		Are hypotheses carefully identified as such?	
14.	Quality	Is the article written in an appropriate way?	
		Are the data and analyses presented appropriately?	
		Are the highest standards for presentation of the results used?	
15.	Scientific Soundness	Is the study correctly designed and technically sound?	
		Are the analyses performed with the highest technical standards?	
		Is the data robust enough to draw conclusions?	
		Are the methods, tools, software, and reagents described with sufficient details to allow another researcher to reproduce the results?	
		Is the raw data available and correct (where applicable)?	
16.	Interest to the Readers	Are the conclusions interesting for the readership of the journal?	
		Will the paper attract a wide readership, or be of interest only to a limited number of people? (Please see the Aims and Scope of the journal.)	
17.	Overall Merit	Is there an overall benefit to publishing this work?	
		Does the work advance the current knowledge?	
		Do the authors address an important long-standing question with smart experiments?	
		Do the authors present a negative result of a valid scientific hypothesis?	
18.	English Level	Is the English language appropriate and understandable?	
Total:			

Reviewers' comments:

A brief summary (one short paragraph) outlining the aim of the paper, its main contributions and strengths.

Review: commenting on the completeness of the review topic covered, the relevance of the review topic, the gap in knowledge identified, the appropriateness of references, etc.

These comments are focused on the scientific content of the manuscript and should be specific enough for the authors to be able to respond.

Specific comments referring to line numbers, tables or figures that point out inaccuracies within the text or sentences that are unclear. These comments should also focus on the scientific content and not on spelling, formatting or English language problems, as these can be addressed at a later stage by our internal staff.

General questions to be taken into consideration for overall recommendation:

- Is the manuscript clear, relevant for the field and presented in a well-structured manner?
- Are the cited references mostly recent publications (within the last 5 years) and relevant? Does it include an excessive number of self-citations?
- Is the manuscript scientifically sound and is the experimental design appropriate to test the hypothesis?
- Are the manuscript's results reproducible based on the details given in the methods section?
- Are the figures/tables/images/schemes appropriate? Do they properly show the data? Are they easy to interpret and understand? Is the data interpreted appropriately and consistently throughout the manuscript? Please include details regarding the statistical analysis or data acquired from specific databases.
- Are the conclusions consistent with the evidence and arguments presented?
- Please evaluate the ethics statements and data availability statements to ensure they are adequate.

Overall recommendation for publication

Please provide an overall recommendation for the next processing stage of the manuscript as follows:

- A. Accepted in the initial form – The manuscript can be accepted without any further changes;
- B. Accepted with minor modifications – The manuscript can in principle be accepted after revision based on the reviewer's comments. Authors are given five days for minor revisions;
- C. Accepted with substantial modifications – The acceptance of the manuscript would depend on the revisions. The author needs to provide a point-by-point response or provide a rebuttal if some of the reviewer's comments cannot be revised. A maximum of two rounds of major revision per manuscript is normally provided. Authors will be asked to resubmit the revised paper within ten days and the revised version will be returned to the reviewer for further comments. If the required revision time is estimated to be longer than 2 months, we will recommend that authors withdraw their manuscript before resubmitting so as to avoid unnecessary time pressure and to ensure that all manuscripts are sufficiently revised.
- D. Rejected - The manuscript has serious flaws, makes no original contribution, and the manuscript may be rejected with no offer of resubmission to the journal.

Reviewers' name: [REDACTED]