



**Manuscript: “Elaboration of a Model of Temporary Cooperation in Tourism’
Destination Promotion A Systematic Literature Review”**

Submitted: 18 August 2020

Accepted: 14 October 2020

Published: 31 October 2020

Corresponding Author: Maria Garbelli

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n28p55

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gilly Kessy

Mwenge Catholic University, Tanzania

Reviewer 2: H.A.N. Hettiarachchi

University of Sri Jayewardenepura, Sri Lanka

Reviewer 3: Iulia-Cristina Muresan

University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Romania

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. H.A.N. Hettiarachchi	
University/Country: University of Sri Jayewardenepura – Sri Lanka	
Date Manuscript Received: 20.08.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 30.08.2020
Manuscript Title: A MODEL OF TEMPORARY COOPERATION IN TOURISM TO PROMOTE A DESTINATION: THE VIRTUAL ENTERPRISE AND THE PIVOTAL ROLE OF THE DMO.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 10.09.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i>
	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	02
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Though the title is appropriate, avoidance of shorten forms such as DMO is more suitable. Use the full term in the topic and the abbreviation herein after. 	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	01
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very interesting and significant research area. • Abstract should include the objective/s, methodology in brief. And also the major research findings/results. • Key words used need to reflect the core idea of the title and the ideas of the manuscript. Carefully refer the whole manuscript and put the key words. • The abstract is just a general description. It does not reflect an abstract idea of the research manuscript. • It is recommended to re-write the abstract. 	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	01
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexical errors is a common and a noticeable fault in this manuscript. And also the unorganized arrangements of the text including the formats of the tables, figures etc. are need be taken into consideration. There is no a uniform combination even in the fonts, font sizes which are used in the text of the manuscript. Ref. Table 02 for an example. 	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	03
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section is little confusing. Please explain precisely the data collection and analytical techniques employed. • It is recommended to write a general introduction about the methodology at the beginning. It should include a clear idea about what this manuscript is based on and the relevant literature. • The rest of the methodological part is at a quite satisfactory level. • But it too need to be re-arranged into an order to provide an inclusive idea to the reader. 	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	02
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer the comments in section 03 	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	01
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no conclusion part in this paper. And also the results and discussions are not sufficient. 	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	02
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The list of reference need to be re-arranged according to the in-text citations. It is just a bibliography. There are some in-text citations which are not in the list of reference. • There is a prominent space for the reference than the other sections of the research. For example, the total number of words of this paper is almost 6000. Out of which 1200 words have been allocated only for the references in the list of reference. • The author of this paper is kindly advised to follow the guidelines provided 	

by the ESJ.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Along with the comments given in the relevant parts, please consider the following general comments to develop the paper.

- Very interesting and significant research area.
- Abstract should include the methodology, objectives in brief. And also the major research findings.
- Introduction - Give **more appropriate** references to the topic and based on those **write a concrete introduction** rather than just a long simple introduction.
- Even though, there are some empirical evidences which are relevant to the topic, these should be included at the appropriate places in justifying certain statements. Moreover, better to highlight the area of study, and finally state **what this study is focused on**.
- Problem statement - problem statement should show the identified gap/s, giving a sound justification on how the gap/s were identified. (This part has been ignored).
- Research objectives - Better to state the objectives separately or under the introduction and background of the study.
- Methodology – This section is little confusing. Please explain precisely the data (literature) collection and analytical techniques employed.
- Discussion – Discuss your findings giving respective empirical evidences to justify the results. (Even though this part is most important in a research paper, very small attention has been given in this paper)
- Conclusion - State whether your objectives have been met specifically. (There is no conclusion in this paper).
- Future research suggestions are at a satisfactory level.
- References provided are too long and some are inappropriate. Please refer most relevant literature.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Well captured)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(The language well structured)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Well explained, however, research method used to undertake this study should be explicitly explained in the methodology section. For example the researcher should state whether it is empirical review, critical review, theoretical review or systematic review. If model building what are the input data for the model)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(The body is clear but need more elaboration as the discussion is too short)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Conclusion section after or before limitations and future research would be appropriate)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Comprehensive current literature has been used appropriately. The author should make sure that the reference is consistent, For example Bramwell, B. Sharman, A. (2000) and is missing)</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is well written and structured according to the theme of the study. The paper would be more interesting if the author will explicitly state the methodology clearly and expand the discussion and conclusion sections.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: