

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_121830</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The effects of crises on the tourism sector: the case of Greece</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Policy Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p><b>It could be a very interesting document, but it is a technical report and not a scientific article, it lacks theoretical foundation, literature review, for this reason, the theoretical and practical implications of the results are not discussed and the conclusions are very general.</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>No</b>            It lacks a theoretical foundation.            No literature reviews.            Very good segment of methods and tools.            In the results segment, they are only descriptive; more in-depth and robust statistical analysis is needed. Since there is no theoretical foundation and a review of the literature, there is no discussion of the implications of the results and a comparison with other studies worldwide, so there is no discussion at all.            The conclusions are very general, fine for a report, but not for an article; there are no theoretical and practical conclusions. There is no future lines of research.            Regarding the bibliography, it is very limited, based on the absence of a more in-depth review of the literature.</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This document seems to me to be more a very good technical report than a scientific article.            It lacks a theoretical foundation.            No literature reviews.            Very good segment of methods and tools.            In the results segment, they are only descriptive; more in-depth and robust statistical analysis is needed. Since there is no theoretical foundation and a review of the literature, there is no discussion of the implications of the results and a comparison with other studies worldwide, so there is no discussion at all.            The conclusions are very general, fine for a report, but not for an article; there are no theoretical and practical conclusions. There is no future lines of research.            Regarding the bibliography, it is very limited, based on the absence of a more in-depth review of the literature.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p><b>No</b>            Regarding the bibliography, it is very limited, based on the absence of a more in-depth review of the literature.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>This is my first review in this journal, so my general comments are as follows: This document seems to me to be more a very good technical report than a scientific article. It lacks a theoretical foundation. No literature reviews. Very good segment of methods and tools. In the results segment, they are only descriptive; more in-depth and robust statistical analysis is needed. Since there is no theoretical foundation and a review of the literature, there is no discussion of the implications of the results and a comparison with other studies worldwide, so there is no discussion at all. The conclusions are very general, fine for a report, but not for an article; there are no theoretical and practical conclusions. There is no future lines of research. Regarding the bibliography, it is very limited, based on the absence of a more in-depth review of the literature.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i></p>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Jose Luis Cornejo Ortega</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Centro Universitario De La Costa, Mexico</b></p>