

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 9-12-2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 10-12-2016
Manuscript Title:	
<i>CREATING DISTINCTIVE VALUE PROPOSITION IN TOURISM BY BUSINESS MODEL TOOLS: CASE STUDY OF CITY OF OHIRD</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: d116	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The title is clear</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Abstract could be more clear in presenting objectives, methods and results</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>This is not a native speaking language, but one can understand the meaning. I conclude that this is the way we speak English in Europe out of Great Britain</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>There is one method – a questionnaire with a few questions only so there is not a lot to be explained.</i>	

<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The body of a paper is clear</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The conclusions are accurate</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	<b>x</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

One cannot use “mission impossible” in the scientific text (p.2), , there are no dates with names of cited papers in the literature review section. There is no hypothesis in the paper.

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

Dear Editor,

Regarding the manuscript 12116/16, we received reviewer's comments and we have corrected the following issues in the manuscript:

1. We have extended the abstract with couple of sentences regarding the methods and results from.
2. We have made one more proof reading in order to clear some grammatical errors.
3. Regarding the explanation of the study method, starting from page 12 till the end of the paper the methodology of designing business model according to "business model canvas" is extensively explained.
4. We have reformulated a sentence, according to the request of the reviewer
5. We have added dates beside some authors' names which were omitted.
6. Finally, we have added hypothesis in the introduction, according to the request of the reviewer.

Please find the corrected version of the manuscript attached.

Sincerely,

Stojan Debarliev, Ph.D.

Associate Professor

