

**Paper: “The Typicality of the Agri-Food Product Driver of the Enhancement of Destination Tourism The Apulian Case History”**

**Submitted: 08 December 2021**

**Accepted: 26 January 2022**

**Published: 31 January 2022**

Corresponding Author: Arianna Di Vittorio

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n1p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n1p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Asli Cazorla Milla  
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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!***

Date Manuscript Received: 17/01/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/01/2022
Manuscript Title: The typicality of the agri-food product driver of the enhancement of destination tourism. The Apulian case history	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1267/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

## **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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>The title of the manuscript is suitable, no need to change it. It would be better to start the manuscript with an introduction because it is directly starting with the item “1. Typical products and their relationship with the territory” .</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The abstract mentions the objective , methodology and the results of the manuscript. In the methodology section of the abstract, it would be better to mention the number of the survey participants.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>It seems that the manuscript has been gone through a proofreading and therefore there are no grammatical errors and spelling mistakes that disturbs the reader.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>In the methodology, we are only able to read that it was based on a survey. How the survey was administered is also explained. But there are no other statistical methods used. It could have been better to use at least descriptive statistics to strengthen the study.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The results section is actually the biggest section of the paper. Each question is explained and demonstrated with a graph. This makes is easy to follow the sequence of the results.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The conclusions are very thorough and they are tailored to the practitioners more than theorists. The concerned industry can benefit from these results.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>There is only one reference is from 2019, and majority are from earlier dates. It would be advisable for future to use also references from 2020 and 2021.</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
------------------------------	----------

Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

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