

"CUTURAL TOURISM"
ARTICLE REVIEW FORM

date 1.12.2011

For the editors' information

AUTOR:

SURNAME AND NAME:

DEGREE/ACADEMIC TITLE:

AFFILIATION:

CONTACT EMAIL ADDRESS:

ARTICLE TITLE:

.....

.....

DETAILED EVALUATION:

* the mark „x“ shows example answers, and the commentary presents example remarks

1. Evaluate the presented issue's relevance to the journal profile

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| (6) Complete relevance | Complete lack of relevance (1) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |

Commentary: *e.g., fully relevant to the journal profile / relevant when accepting the assumption that XXX must be considered in the research*

2. Evaluate the meaning of the presented subject for the knowledge about cultural tourism

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| (6) Crucial meaning for ct | Absolutely no meaning for ct (1) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |

Commentary: *e.g., Innovative approach to XXX issue in the NNN field, not presented in Polish subject matter literature so far*

3. Evaluate the quality and level of the theoretical considerations presented in the article

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| (6) Ideal | Unacceptable (1) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |

Commentary: *e.g., Theoretical context and reasons for the choice of the research subject is incomplete: (reference to the main views in the current academic discussion on the subject of XXX is missing)*

4. Evaluate the methodological standards and consistency in the use of research procedures and/or findings.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| (6) Ideal | Unacceptable (1) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 |

Commentary: *e.g., The results of the questionnaire carried out in the XXX environment, mentioned in the introduction, were merely presented numerically, yet their interpretation has not been provided. Despite declaring the use of the XXX method, the author does not consider its criteria in the NNNN aspect.*

5. Evaluate the practical relevance of the text (the possibility of using its results or conclusions in practice)

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (6) Very wide possibilities | | | No perspective of its use (1) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Commentary: e.g., The text refers to the particular target group; the possibility of using a group of products in the construction of

6. Evaluate linguistic quality (the relevance of the used terms, comprehensibility for a leader):

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (6) Excellent | | | Unacceptable (1) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Commentary: e.g., Language full of unexplained terminology from a narrow scope of XXX (especially in chapter 2). Sentences are too long... / or: Colloquial language, too personal phrases.

7. Evaluate the text edition compliance with the editorial requirements of the journal (summaries, structure, photographic images, tables, citation methods, bibliography layout):

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (6) Full compliance | | | No compliance (1) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Commentary: e.g., Tables described below, not above them, citations according to two different methods, no separate summary, no key words)

REVIEWERS'S RECOMMENDATIONS:

8. Final evaluation. Make general recommendations as for the text publication:
(mark one option only):

- The text is ready for publication without any corrections/amendments.
- The text is ready for publication after implementing reviewer's remarks.
- The text is not suitable for publication.

9. Recommendations and instructions regarding the text of the article:

-
- *e.g., Introduction: In a separate paragraph, consider the discussion status quo with respect to the XXX aspect.*
 - *e.g., Chapter 2: justify the key claim NT XXX with a more precise interpretation of the survey data*
 - *e.g., Summary: point to the necessity of carrying our research*
 - *e.g., Chapter 1: improve linguistically*

10. Recommendations and instructions regarding the correction and edition of the text:

-
- *e.g., Chapter 1: improve linguistically, avoid repetitions*
 - *e.g., Chapter 2: fewer direct citations (the style too much resembles an MA thesis)*
 - *e.g., Chapter 2: The idea of „event“ in paragraph 2 is unclear, better use another word*
 - *e.g., Chapter 3: Table 2. Choose a different form of presentation - a diagram would be much better than a table*

For the editors' information

| |
|------------------------------|
| REVIEWER: |
| SURNAME AND NAME: |
| DEGREE/ACADEMIC TITLE: |

AFFILIATION:

CONTACT EMAIL ADDRESS: