

D 1.5.3 “ApMM for the model of services” Peer Review format

Thanking you for agreeing to referee the “ApMM for the model of services,” developed as part of the FRea Project, we kindly ask you to fill out the following questionnaire and send it to the contacts indicated (ngohorizonti@t-com.me) and remain available for any further information.

Double blind peer review

We inform you that your evaluation will be communicated to interested stakeholders in a totally anonymous form. This model will also be evaluated by other anonymous referees, who will not be aware of your refereeing. In the event that referees express markedly conflicting opinions, the working group reserves the right to have additional referees evaluate the model.

The content of the referees will remain confidential. Working group members, by agreeing to be evaluated, agree not to disclose the peer reviews. Referees agree not to disclose the content of the model during the refereeing process.

Guidelines

The purpose of peer review is to ensure scientificity to the model submitted to the process and possibly provide some guidance to improve its quality. Therefore, we invite the reviewer to prepare the referencing with the following guidelines in mind:

- what modifications could make the model clearer, more consistent, and more relevant to the question addressed?
- by what expedients could the model make a more significant contribution to cross-border cooperation processes?
- how could steps be taken to strengthen any controversial or questionable annexes or passages?

Questionnaire to be filled

Date of the analysis: 28/03/2025

Model under examination: ApMM for the model of services - FRea

Background

- Had you previously viewed a similar model? **YES** NO
- Did you recognize the authors/partners of the model? YES **NO**
- If yes, do you have academic relationships with the partners? YES **NO**

Organization of the text

- Does the length meet usual canons of readability? **YES** NO
- Is the text of deliverables purposely divided into paragraphs? **YES** NO
- Is the language appropriate for a cross-border cooperation model? **YES** NO
- Are the theme and objectives explicit from the outset? **YES** NO
- Is the argumentation and exposition of the arguments clear? **YES** NO

Any suggestions for the working group:

The overall structure is coherent and accessible, and the objectives are well stated from the beginning. However, consider enriching the introductory section with a more contextualized problem statement to help readers unfamiliar with the specific regional challenges of innovative forms of tourism. Additionally, a summary or infographic visualizing the model's components could improve accessibility for non-academic stakeholders.

Contents of the text

- Is the object of the model of management interest? **YES** NO
- Are the literature references relevant and sufficient? YES **NO**
- Is the research conducted on an adequate documentary basis? YES **NO**
- Do the methodological skills appear suitable? **YES** NO
- Can the interpretation be considered balanced? **YES** NO

Any suggestions for the working group:

The literature is appropriately cited and the methodological framework is consistent with current practices in sustainable and innovative tourism management. A more detailed comparison with existing tourism models across similar cross-border regions could further strengthen the relevance of the proposed model. It may also be useful to address potential limitations or challenges in implementation more explicitly.

Overall evaluation

The model can be accepted in the context of cross-border cooperation processes?

[1] Yes, *without* revisions.

[2] Yes, with *few* revisions.

[3] Yes, with *a lot* of revisions.

[4] No.

In case [1], would you like to add comments and/or suggestions for the working group?
The model demonstrates strong potential for application in cross-border cooperation, with clear objectives, appropriate methodology, and well-grounded research. The structure is coherent, and the language is accessible for international collaboration. The working group is encouraged to consider integrating more visual aids or case-based examples in future updates to enhance practical applicability.

In case [2], please indicate in detail the interventions to be made.

- Clarify the model's objectives more explicitly in the introduction.
- Improve paragraph segmentation to enhance readability.
- Review and expand literature references to ensure inclusion of recent and diverse sources.
- Add a brief summary of the methodological approach for better transparency.
- Ensure neutral and accessible language for broader cross-border relevance.

In case [3], please specify the unavoidable interventions to be made by the working group and indicate further appropriate corrections.

- Redefine the model's scope and objectives to align more clearly with cross-border cooperation priorities.
- Reorganize the structure to improve coherence and logical progression of arguments.
- Strengthen the research foundation by incorporating a wider range of relevant, up-to-date literature.

**FRea**

- Clarify and justify the methodology in more detail, including its relevance to the context.
- Review and revise the text to ensure clarity, avoid jargon, and adopt a more accessible tone.

In case [4], please give reasons for your assessment.

The current version of the model lacks clarity in its objectives and methodological foundation, making it unsuitable for implementation in cross-border cooperation contexts. The research base is insufficient, and the references do not adequately support the model's claims. Significant restructuring and reconceptualization would be necessary for reconsideration.