

Paper: “Tourist itineraries for Sustainable Mobility: an application in the Salento Area (Italy)”

Submitted: 01 July 2024

Accepted: 25 July 2024

Published: 31 July 2024

Corresponding Author: Barbara Trincone

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n19p17](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n19p17)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Fabio Carlucci
Università degli Studi di Salerno, Italy

Reviewer 3: Ana Gvaramadze
Grigol Robakidze University, Georgia

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 6/7/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 8/7/2024
Manuscript Title: Tourist itineraries for Sustainable Mobility: an application in the Salento Area (Italy)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0730/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: NO	
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.	5
<i>The title describes exactly the contents developed in the article</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>The abstract summarises what was later developed in the article</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Although not written in perfect English, the text is sufficiently clear in its content</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The study methods are very clear and comprehensive</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are clear and interesting</i>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>It is also suggested that the possible weaknesses of the experience marred in the identification of the two planned tourist routes be reported in the conclusions.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are enough</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 article is very interesting and the topic topical. To further improve some aspects of it, it is suggested to:

- the descriptions of the contents in English in Fig. 1 and Fig. 5 to make them easier to read
- that possible weaknesses found in the design of the courses be stated in the conclusions.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No suggestions

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: Ana Gvaramadze	
University/Country: Georgia, Tbilisi	
Date Manuscript Received: 4 th July, 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 9 th July, 2024
Manuscript Title: Tourist itineraries for Sustainable Mobility: an application in the Salento Area (Italy)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 7431	ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431
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: 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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>Presents, but it needs highlighting and clarifying what the object of the article was, what methods were used.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Some errors, e.g. Improper Use of Articles:</i>	

"The strategic Interreg V-A Greece-Italy cross-border cooperation project 2014/2020 called "AI SMART_Adriatic Ionian Small Port Network", managed by the Apulia Region, aims at the implementation and development of a common port network in the Adriatic-Ionian area" – The article "the" before "strategic" is unnecessary.

Misplaced Modifiers:

"It should be emphasised that the five traditional environmental pollutants include transport emissions." – The placement of "include" can be confusing. Rephrasing for clarity would help.

Complex Sentences:

"It should be emphasised that the five traditional environmental pollutants include transport emissions." – This sentence could be restructured for clarity.

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Generally, yes.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Generally, yes.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion is accurate but could benefit from some restructuring and clarity to ensure that the main points are easily understood.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Yes.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: