



Tourism Educators Association of Malaysia (TEAM) JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM

REVIEWER REPORT

Manuscript Title	Tourist Perceptions of Planning and Design Sustainable Tourism in Puncak
Publication	Volume 20, Issue 1, 2023
Reviewer's Name	Anonymous
Affiliation	Anonymous

Please rate by ticking (√) in the appropriate boxes using the following scales:

Poor					Good
1	2	3	4	5	

TITLE	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
The title is relevant and reflects the overall contents of the study.				√		

ABSTRACT	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
The abstract is clear and precise and contains basic information, summarizing the purpose of the study, issues, methodology, findings, and significance.			√			
Keywords are relevant and appropriate (<i>Maximum 5 only</i>)			√			

INTRODUCTION	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
The introduction clearly demonstrates the focal point of the study (essential variables in the study).			√			

The build-up to the problem statement is briefly introduced with recent literature to support the study's purpose.						
The purpose(s), research question(s), and significance of the topic and area of study are stated clearly.				√		
The significance of the study is well-articulated that summarized: a) knowledge generation, b) industrial application, c) managerial implication			√			

LITERATURE REVIEW	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
Indicate appropriate preparation and knowledge progress by reviewing the subject's literature.			√			
The narrative includes a comparison/contrast of various viewpoints or research outcomes.			√			
The content of the review is recent and drawn from acceptable peer-reviewed journals.			√			

METHOD	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
The research paradigm, sampling procedure, and instrumentation are well-explained with proper justifications.				√		
The process of data gathering, procedure and examination is clearly justified.			√			
The plan for data analysis is cross-examined with the hypothesis development or objective of the study.			√			

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
The results are presented in sequential order and clearly explained.				√		
The findings are clear, well-grounded and thought-out.			√			
The conclusions adequately connect relevant findings with the objective of the study.			√			

The explanation of the study's implications incorporates future research and the progress of industry, technology, and society.				√		
---	--	--	--	---	--	--

WRITING STYLE	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
The paper has correct grammar, punctuation, spelling, and sentence structure.			√			
The paper does not overly rely on limited sources and has a fair distribution of past worldview literature.			√			
Citations (in-text & in-parentheses) are in the reference list.				√		

RECOMMENDATION

Please tick (√) your recommendation for publication in the TEAM Journal

	Accepted and ready for publication
√	Accepted with minor amendments
	Major amendments and subject to improvements
	Reject

Comment: (Please include details comments on how to improve the manuscript)

Please include more recent citations from other key segments.
Overall the findings can assist future researcher to plan on item development

REVIEWER ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1. **Contribution to editorial decisions**
Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and, through editorial communications with the author, may also assist the author in improving the paper. Peer review is essential to formal scholarly communication and lies at the heart of the scientific method.
2. **Promptness**
Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows its prompt review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself from the review process.
3. **Confidentiality**
Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents and must not be shown to or discussed with others except as authorized by the editor.
4. **Standards of objectivity**
Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate, and reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.
5. **Acknowledgement of sources**
Reviewers should identify relevant published work that the authors have not cited, and relevant citations should accompany any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had previously reported. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper they know personally.
6. **Disclosure and conflict of interest**
Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in the reviewers' research without the author's written consent. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage.