



## GEOJOURNAL OF TOURISM AND GEOSITES

University of Oradea, Department of Geography, Tourism and Territorial Planning

1 Universitatii Street, 410087 Oradea, România, Phone/Fax: 0040 259 408 475,

<http://gtg.webhost.uoradea.ro>, e-mail: [gtg.uoradea@yahoo.com](mailto:gtg.uoradea@yahoo.com)

---

# REFEREE REPORT – CONFIDENTIAL

Sent to referee on:

**2022**   **03**   **07**  
Month   Day

Please return (electronically) by:

**2022**   **03**   **30**  
year   month   Day

Dear Professor,

We kindly ask you to provide your assessment, as referee, for the attached manuscript that was submitted for publication in *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*.

**Please evaluate the paper according to the following criteria:**

- importance of the subject
- originality of the approach
- degree of interest to our readership
- clarity of the manuscript structure (abstract, keywords, introduction, methodology, discussions, conclusions, references etc.)
- strength of the argument
- writing style

Please note that  
Geojournal of Tourism and Geosites  
endorses Geo-publishing.org's Good Practice in Refereeing:  
<http://www.nuim.ie/nirsa/geo-pub/geo-refereeing.html>

If you are unable to review the manuscript within the mentioned date, please be so kind and inform us by email ([gtg.uoradea@yahoo.com](mailto:gtg.uoradea@yahoo.com)). In this case, it would be helpful for us if you could suggest alternative referees.

Best regards,

Dorina Camelia ILIEȘ and Wojciech Ratkowski – Editors

Ioana Josan – Associate Editor

## REFEREE REPORT – CONFIDENTIAL

### REVIEW REPORT

Title of the paper:

WHAT DRIVES IN THE TOURISM INDUSTRY? CONFIRMATION BY EMPIRICAL REVIEW

#### A. GENERAL EVALUATION OF THE PAPER

Please mark your opinion for the following indicators:

1. The paper represents a significant contribution for theory/knowledge/research:

Yes  Should be revised  No

Comments:

2. The structure of the paper is clear:

Yes  Should be revised  No

Comments:

3. The theoretical grounding of the paper is adequate:

Yes  Should be revised  No

Comments:

4. The references used are up-to-date:

Yes  Should be revised  No

Comments:

5. The references used are relevant for the subject:

Yes  Should be revised  No

Comments:

6. The research design of the paper is adequate:

Yes  Should be revised  No

Comments:

7. The data analysis is adequate/relevant:

Yes  Should be revised  No

Comments:

8. The interpretations and conclusions of the paper are in accordance with the analysis:

Yes  Should be revised  No

Comments:

9. The argumentation of the paper is clear and coherent:

Yes  Should be revised  No

Comments:

10. The quality of the English language is adequate:

Yes  Should be revised  No

Comments:

---

## REFEREE REPORT – CONFIDENTIAL

### B. SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS ABOUT THE STRUCTURE OF THE PAPER

#### 1. Abstract:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good/Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/>	Should / could be shortened
<input type="checkbox"/>	Should / could be extended
<input type="checkbox"/>	Is not relevant

Comments:

#### 2. Introduction:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good/Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/>	Should / could be shortened
<input type="checkbox"/>	Should / could be extended
<input type="checkbox"/>	Are not relevant

Comments:

#### 3. Material and methods:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Good/Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/>	Should / could be shortened
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Should / could be extended
<input type="checkbox"/>	Are not relevant

Comments:

#### 4. Results and discussions:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good/Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/>	Should / could be shortened
<input type="checkbox"/>	Should / could be extended
<input type="checkbox"/>	Are not relevant

Comments:

#### 4. Conclusions:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good/Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/>	Should / could be shortened
<input type="checkbox"/>	Should / could be extended
<input type="checkbox"/>	Are not relevant

Comments:

#### 5. Figures/graphs/maps/photos:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Clear
<input type="checkbox"/>	Relevant
<input type="checkbox"/>	Some could be omitted

## REFEREE REPORT – CONFIDENTIAL

Some, or all should be revised

Comments:

### 6. Tables:

- Clear  
 Relevant  
 Some could be omitted  
 Some, or all should be revised

Comments:

5. The references used for the figures, tables, graphs, maps are suitable and accurate?

Yes  Should be revised  No

Comments:

### C. EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK

1. Please indicate some suggestions for improving the paper:

**The paper addresses important issues on factors driving the tourism industry in Samarinda using empirical evidence. The paper is fairly adequate in form and content; however, it could have been organised better to enhance the flow of ideas and arguments presented. Several glaring grammatical errors and poorly constructed sentences in the paper tend to undermine its quality. In addition, there are methodological issues, particularly in the section on data collection, which need to be beefed up.**

2. Other comments and observations:

**The authors may consider revising the title of the paper to reflect the content**

3. Would you like to get the revised version of the paper from the authors?

Yes  No

**RECOMMENDATION** – please mark one of the following boxes:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>ACCEPT THE PAPER AS IT IS</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>ACCEPT THE PAPER WITH MINOR CHANGES</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>RESUBMIT THE PAPER, REQUIRES MAJOR REVISION</b> (please select only if the paper is of real value)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>REJECT THE PAPER</b>

Date:

12<sup>th</sup> April 2022