Journal of Tourism and Services
Vysoká škola obchodní v Praze, o. p. s.
Spálená 14,110 00 Praha

Issue:
Volume :

Manuscript Review

Paper Title:

Reviewer:

Reviewer´s Place of Employment:

Evaluation (Please, answer the questions)	Reviewer opinion and recommendations	Evaluation
Quality of the manuscript (i.e. novelty, complexity, scientific level). Does the manuscript demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature and cite an appropriate range of sources? Is any significant work ignored? Is there a correlation between the Aim, Objectives, Hypotheses and Results, Literature Review and Results?		
Scientific novelty and originality of the approach. Does the manuscript contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication? Are the Aim and Objectives clearly set?		
Methodology. Is the manuscript´s argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are appropriate methods employed?		

Clarity of presentation of results. Does the manuscript clearly express its case, measured against the technical language used in tourism and services and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, relevance of figures and tables etc.		
Results and conclusion. Are results presented clearly and analyzed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the manuscript?		
Practical implications, implications for research and/or society. Does the manuscript identify clearly implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the manuscript bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice, what impact it has on economy and commerce. Can the research be used in teaching, to influence public policy? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the manuscript?		

EXCELLENT - 1: Excellent manuscript which illustrates a comprehensive understanding of the salient issues and considerable evidence of in-depth analysis and judgment where appropriate. The manuscript refers widely and accurately to relevant authoritative sources, which support a well, argued answer. Appropriate and relevant conceptual frameworks are identified and applied. Critical analysis of the topic is evident. The data are linked in both theoretical and real-life practice.
VERY GOOD - 2: Good manuscript, distinctly above average which displays a sound understanding of the most salient issues with evidence of independent analysis and judgment where appropriate. The integration of knowledge and skills is in evidence and a holistic perspective is adopted. Real-life application is evident.
GOOD - 3: Fair manuscript, generally sounds. Although many of the issues have been understood, the conceptual framework is weak. This lack of conceptual understanding is due to incomplete research and critical analysis of the issues. Some evidence of the link between conceptual knowledge and real-life practical application is in evidence.
UNSATISFACTORY - 4: The manuscript meets the minimum criteria for acceptance. There is a lack of a conceptual base. The research is incomplete and little attempt has been made to understand and apply the relevant concepts. The work is very descriptive and has little or no critical analysis or real-life practical application. It contains little or no theoretical or conceptual base and/or adopts a single narrow perspective.

Comments to the Author/Authors:

Comments to the Editor:

I, the Reviewer

a) recommend the manuscript for publishing

b) recommend the manuscript for publishing after minor revisions (see my comments)

c) recommend the manuscript for publishing after re-make/amend the paper (see my comments)

d) do not recommend the manuscript for publishing (see my comments)

(Please, encircle the adequate answer.)

……
Date and Place

Reviewer´s Signature