

Paper: “Discovering the best practices of Total Quality Management influencing performance in the Moroccan hospitality industry”

Submitted: 02 March 2025

Accepted: 22 April 2025

Published: 30 April 2025

Corresponding Author: Ikram Bel Haddioui

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n10p176

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Vasilika Kume
University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2: Foldi Kata
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 3: Saverio Lovergine
Tor Vergata University of Rome, Italy

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: Saverio Lovergine	
University/Country: INAPP, University of Rome "Tor Vergata", Italy	
Date Manuscript Received: 05/03/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/03/2025
Manuscript Title: Discovering the best practices of Total Quality Management influencing performance in the Moroccan hospitality industry	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0335/25	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is clear, descriptive and in line with the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study, describing its objectives, methodology and main conclusions. However, the abstract would benefit from a more explicit presentation of the main quantitative results obtained.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The article is well written, with a good command of academic English. However, there are some minor linguistic inaccuracies and structural choices that could be</i>	

<i>improved for better readability. In some sections, punctuation and sentence structure could be simplified to improve fluidity.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p><i>The methodology section is well structured and detailed. Clearly describes the sample selection, the data collection process and the use of the PLS-SEM model for analysis. However, some additional details would improve transparency and replicability:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• The justification for using a sample of 93 hotels could be strengthened by specifying whether this number is sufficient to ensure the robustness of the PLS-SEM analysis.</i> <i>• The response rate to the questionnaire is not mentioned (How many questionnaires were sent?), which is important for assessing the representativeness of the sample.</i> 	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<p><i>The results are presented clearly and coherently. Statistical analyses are effectively supported by tables and key indicators (e.g., Cronbach's alpha, AVE, p-values), and the research model is well illustrated. However, some interpretations could be made more compelling. For example, the discussion of results related to leadership and employee involvement (which are found to be less impactful than strategy and processes) would benefit from a broader theoretical justification.</i></p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<p><i>The conclusions accurately reflect the study's findings and provide interesting insights into future research. However, the section on managerial implications could be expanded to offer more practical recommendations on how hotels can effectively implement the best practices identified.</i></p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<p><i>The article includes a comprehensive and relevant bibliographical review, citing key studies on TQM and EFQM. The theoretical framework is well supported by references to important academic contributions. However, the inclusion of more recent sources could further strengthen the study's contribution.)</i></p>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article provides a solid empirical contribution, the methodology is well-articulated, and the results are rigorously presented. However, minor stylistic refinements, clearer articulation of managerial implications, and a stronger emphasis on the study's originality would further enhance the paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title of the article is correct and related to content.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract contains objects, methods and main results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There is only one stylistic mistake on page 8 "bootstrapping" word.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are explained clearly. I only missed the period of time of the questionnaire survey.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is clear and do not contain errors. I only missed from the results part the 5-point likert scale question the mean, standard deviation and relative standard deviation.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please use different expression instead of bootstrapping.

I only missed from the results part the 5-point likert scale question the mean, standard deviation and relative standard deviation.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and reflects the content of the paper very well.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract clearly describes what this study aims to achieve, the method used, and the contributions of the study.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

there are no grammatical errors

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

the study methods are explained clearly.

My suggestion is to determine how representative the 93 businesses are of the total number of businesses in the country. This will tell us whether the results can be generalized.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of paper is clear

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusions are clear.

I think it should also include who the groups that will benefit from this study are.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is Okay

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

My suggestion is to determine how representative the 93 businesses are of the total number of businesses in the country. This will tell us whether the results can be generalized.

I think it should also include who the groups that will benefit from this study are.
