



University of Kragujevac
Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism

HOTEL AND TOURISM MANAGEMENT

Reviewers' Guidelines

Reviewers' responsibilities

Reviewers are required to provide the qualified and timely assessment of the scholarly merits of the manuscript. The reviewer takes special care of the real contribution and originality of the manuscript. The review must be fully objective. The judgment of the reviewers must be clear and substantiated by arguments.

The reviewers assess manuscript for the compliance with the profile of the journal, the relevance of the investigated topic and applied methods, the scientific relevance of information presented in the manuscript, the presentation style and scholarly apparatus. The review has a standard format. It is submitted through the online journal management system where it is stored permanently.

The reviewer must not be in a conflict of interest with the authors or funders of research. If such a conflict exists, the reviewer is obliged to promptly notify the Editors. The reviewer shall not accept for reviewing papers beyond the field of his/her full competence.

Reviewers should alert the Editors to any well-founded suspicions or the knowledge of possible violations of ethical standards by the authors. Reviewers should recognize relevant published works that have not been considered in the manuscript. They may recommend specific references for citation, but shall not require to cite papers published in Hotel and Tourism Management, or their own papers, unless it is justified.

The reviewers are expected to improve the quality of the manuscript through their suggestions. If they recommend correction of the manuscript prior to publication, they are obliged to specify the manner in which this can be achieved.

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. Reviewers must not use unpublished materials disclosed in submitted manuscripts without the express written consent of the authors.

Basic principles of Reviewing

- Only agree to review manuscripts within your area of expertise
- Respect the confidentiality of the process
- Be objective and constructive in your review
- Declare all conflicts of interest

01 Initial Impression

Read the whole paper through before you start your in-depth review to get an initial impression

What to look out for and comment on

- Is this paper relevant for the journal?
- Is this research significant within the field?
- Is the work presented novel? Does it add to the subject area?

What to keep an eye on

- Does the title properly reflect the subject of the paper?
- Do the keywords reflect the content and are they up-to-date?
- Is the paper an appropriate length?

02 Sections of the Paper

Abstract

- Verify whether the abstract is structured, i.e., whether it includes the following sections: Purpose, Methodology, Findings, Implications.
- The abstract should be between 150 and 200 words long.

Introduction

- Is it clear, short and simple?
- Does it set out and justify the aim of the study?

Background

- Does it set the scene i.e. explain the background to the study?
- Does the literature review include the latest research?

Materials and methods

- Materials and methods section should provide a reader with sufficient details and argue all the necessary aspects in order to allow other researchers to replicate the research and build the published results.

Results and discussion

The authors should report the results of all tests noted in the Materials and methods section:

- Ask yourself: do the numbers make sense?
- Are the results clearly formatted and presented?
- Discussion should not be a repetition of the results
- It should put the results of the study in context i.e.
- how does it fit in with what we already know?

The authors should compare their data with previous published studies to:

- Confirm similarities i.e. validate the study further
- Explain differences

Conclusion

- The conclusion summarizes the results achieved during the research, along with the limitations of the conducted research and future research recommendations.

03 Your Feedback

Giving advice to authors and suggesting revisions

- Demonstrate that you have read the paper. You may wish to include an opening paragraph summarising the paper.
- Be objective, specific and constructive
- Be clear about what needs to be added or revised

- Give constructive comments to the author/s to help them with any revisions
- Give clear and detailed comments to the Editor
- If appropriate, make suggestions about additional literature that the author might read to improve their manuscript*

Making a recommendation

Recommend whether a paper should be accepted, rejected or revised (major or minor revisions)

Remember to keep all activity, content and comments relating to the paper confidential

*As per COPE guidelines, reviewers should not suggest that authors include citations to the reviewer's work merely to increase their citation count or to enhance the visibility of their work; suggestions **must** be based on valid academic reasons.