

review_form_2026_03

Instructions

Please assess the manuscript against Turistica's aims and scope (explicit linkage to tourism and/or defensible interdisciplinary relevance).

Distinguish major issues (blocking acceptance) from minor issues (improvements that do not affect publishability).

Where you request changes, indicate whether they are mandatory for acceptance or recommended.

Please provide constructive, specific comments and refer to manuscript sections/pages where possible.

Fit with Turistica (aims & scope)

Is the manuscript a good fit for Turistica's aims and scope?

Is the linkage to tourism explicit and defensible (or, if interdisciplinary, is the relevance to tourism clearly articulated and substantial)?

Does the manuscript offer a contribution consistent with the journal's focus on original studies and applied analyses?

Select one option below.

- ☐ Strong fit
- ☐ Fit (minor reframing needed)
- ☐ Borderline fit
- ☐ Out of scope
- ☐ Unsure

Ethics, integrity, and transparency

Are ethics/consent procedures adequately described where human participants or sensitive data are involved (where applicable)?

Are funding sources and conflicts of interest transparently declared?

Where relevant, are data/materials availability statements adequate?

Do you see any integrity concerns that require editorial attention?

Select all that apply. If you select a concern, briefly explain it in “Confidential comments to the editor”.

- ☐ No concerns identified
- ☐ Human-participant ethics/consent unclear or missing
- ☐ COI/funding transparency unclear or missing
- ☐ Possible plagiarism/self-plagiarism
- ☐ Data/figure credibility concerns
- ☐ Other (specify in confidential comments)

Title and abstract

Does the title accurately reflect the manuscript’s focus and main contribution?

Does the abstract clearly state context, aim(s), approach/method, key findings/arguments, and main implications?

Is the tourism linkage (or tourism-relevant interdisciplinary relevance) understandable to an international readership?

Select one option below (or choose “Not applicable” where appropriate).

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Adequate
- ☐ Needs improvement (major revision-level)
- ☐ Serious concerns
- ☐ Not applicable (N/A)

Literature review and theoretical/conceptual framing

Is the manuscript well positioned in the relevant scholarly literature (including tourism and clearly connected fields)?

Is the review accurate, sufficiently current, and appropriately selective?

Does it identify a clear problem/gap and articulate a coherent theoretical/conceptual framework (or rationale) that guides the research questions, analysis, or argument?

Select one option below (or choose “Not applicable” where appropriate).

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Adequate
- ☐ Needs improvement (major revision-level)
- ☐ Serious concerns
- ☐ Not applicable (N/A)

Methods / approach and transparency

Is the chosen design/approach appropriate to the research question(s) or purpose?

Are data sources/materials and sampling/selection criteria clearly described and justified?

Are data collection and analysis procedures transparent and sufficiently detailed to allow readers to understand and evaluate the work (and, where applicable, replicate it)?

For qualitative research: are analytic steps, trustworthiness strategies, and use of evidence (e.g., excerpts/field materials) adequate?

For quantitative research: are measures, assumptions, and statistical procedures appropriate and correctly reported?

For reviews: is the search/selection strategy and synthesis method clearly described?

Select one option below (or choose “Not applicable” where appropriate).

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Adequate
- ☐ Needs improvement (major revision-level)
- ☐ Serious concerns
- ☐ Not applicable (N/A)

Findings/analysis and discussion

Are the findings/analysis clearly presented and consistent with the methods/approach?

Are claims supported by evidence and reasoning, and presented with appropriate caution?

Does the discussion interpret the findings/arguments in relation to relevant literature and explain why they matter for tourism research/practice (or tourism-relevant debates)?

Are key limitations/constraints acknowledged?

Select one option below (or choose “Not applicable” where appropriate).

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Adequate
- ☐ Needs improvement (major revision-level)
- ☐ Serious concerns
- ☐ Not applicable (N/A)

Conclusions and implications

Do the conclusions follow from the evidence/argument presented (without introducing new results)?

Does the manuscript clearly summarise its contribution (theoretical, methodological, and/or applied)?

Are implications warranted by the findings/analysis, including implications for tourism research, policy, or practice where relevant?

Are limitations and appropriate directions for further research clearly stated?

Select one option below (or choose “Not applicable” where appropriate).

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Adequate
- ☐ Needs improvement (major revision-level)
- ☐ Serious concerns
- ☐ Not applicable (N/A)

Originality and contribution

Does the manuscript make a clear and non-trivial contribution to tourism scholarship (or to a related field with explicit, defensible relevance to tourism)?

Is the novelty evident (e.g., new evidence/data, new analysis, methodological advance, conceptual development, or applied insight)?

Is the contribution clearly distinguished from prior work?

Select one option below (or choose “Not applicable” where appropriate).

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Adequate
- ☐ Needs improvement (major revision-level)
- ☐ Serious concerns

☐ Not applicable (N/A)

Language and readability (English)

Is the manuscript written in clear, grammatically correct English appropriate for an international academic audience?

Is the structure readable and terminology used consistently, so that language does not impede assessment of the scholarly content?

Select one option below (or choose “Not applicable” where appropriate).

☐ Excellent

☐ Good

☐ Adequate

☐ Needs improvement (major revision-level)

☐ Serious concerns

☐ Not applicable (N/A)

Key strengths (for authors)

Briefly summarise the manuscript’s main strengths (e.g., contribution, approach, evidence base, clarity, relevance to tourism debates/practice).

Free text.

Major issues (for authors)

Where helpful, indicate location (section/page/paragraph) and what change would satisfy the point.

[illegible]