

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:

- Consider adding more examples from specific partner regions to improve contextual understanding.
- Explore the inclusion of more case studies that reflect diverse tourism models and their specific needs.

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

FRea

- | | | |
|--|-------------------|----|
| - Do the methodological skills appear suitable? | <u>YES</u> | NO |
| - Can the interpretation be considered balanced? | <u>YES</u> | NO |

Any suggestions for the working group:

- While the literature references are sufficient, it may be helpful to expand on specific success stories from other regions that have implemented similar models to validate the proposed strategies.
- Consider integrating more quantitative data to support the arguments presented.

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 is well-structured and seems to be a great fit for cross-border cooperation. I would encourage the team to keep refining their approach by integrating more diverse partner case studies to ensure comprehensive applicability across different regions.

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

Strengthen the practical implementation sections, particularly the financial aid and sustainability aspects, with more real-life examples and resources for entrepreneurs.

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

The research methodology could be clearer in some sections. Consider revisiting the literature to further clarify the connection between the research and the proposed model.

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

Not applicable in this case.