

**Paper: “Sustainable Tourism Supported by Drafting of the Crossborder Sustainable Mobility Plan (CBSMP) between southern Italy and Greece: Connections among Gallipoli, Brindisi, Thesprotia, and Igoumenitsa”**

**Submitted: 21 October 2024**

**Accepted: 03 December 2024**

**Published: 31 December 2024**

Corresponding Author: Barbara Trincone

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n34p45

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nora Islam

Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Maritime University, Bangladesh

Reviewer 2: Blinded

### **ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024**

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

***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: Nora Islam	
University/Country: Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Maritime University, Bangladesh	
Date Manuscript Received: 5/11/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/11/2024
Manuscript Title: <b>Sustainable tourism supported by the drafting of the Cross-border Sustainable Mobility Plan (PTMS) between southern Italy and Epirus in Greece</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---30.---09.11.2024---	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	Yes. I agree
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

#### **Evaluation Criteria:**

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

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Rating Result</b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The title provides a clear explanation of the technique and content.	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
The abstract is concise and full of information.	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
no Grammatical errors	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
It provides a clear explanation that is relevant to the behavior in question.	

<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
The paper's body is coherent, flowing, and easy to read.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
Yes, the conclusions are well supported	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
References are appropriate	

**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):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**