



ACADEMICFIX

SUBMISSION READINESS / EDITORIAL REVIEW

ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE - NOT A REAL CLIENT FILE

Pre-submission Editorial Review Report

Technical compliance, references and DOI, methods and literature review

FICTIONAL MANUSCRIPT

Perceived Authenticity, Satisfaction and Revisit Intention in Local Gastronomy Experiences

Prepared by AcademicFix as an illustrative delivery sample.

DOCUMENT TYPE Journal manuscript	SAMPLE LENGTH 8,420 words
REFERENCE COUNT 48 references	TARGET International tourism journal

The manuscript, findings, reference issues and review comments in this report are entirely fictional. The purpose is to demonstrate the structure and level of detail of an AcademicFix delivery.



1. Executive summary

The file was reviewed for visible technical compliance and editorial consistency before submission. The core narrative is understandable, but method reporting, citation-reference matching and the justification of the research gap require revision before submission.

OVERALL STATUS	Revision required before submission
----------------	-------------------------------------

Review area	Priority	Key reason
Technical format and journal fit	MODERATE	Heading hierarchy and table formatting need revision.
Citations, references and DOI	HIGH	Unmatched citations and missing DOI records were identified.
Method-analysis alignment	HIGH	Sampling, measurement and model reporting are incomplete.
Literature positioning	MODERATE	The gap is not connected to a clear conceptual mechanism.
Ethics and declarations	LOW	Author contribution and data availability statements are missing.

Five actions before submission

- 01
- Realign the research questions and hypotheses in the same conceptual sequence.
- 02
- Report sampling decisions, fieldwork dates and inclusion criteria.
- 03
- Resolve citation-reference mismatches and verify the located DOI records.
- 04
- Adapt tables and figures to the target journal's format and file requirements.
- 05
- Clarify the mechanism through which perceived authenticity is expected to affect satisfaction.

Scope note: No raw dataset is included in this illustrative sample. Analyses were therefore not recalculated or numerically validated.
--

2. Technical and submission compliance

The findings below were recorded by comparing the visible file structure with the fictional target journal's author requirements.

Code	Priority	Finding	Recommended action
T-01	HIGH	Second- and third-level headings use the same formatting.	Separate heading styles hierarchically and apply one numbering convention.
T-02	HIGH	Tables 2 and 4 appear well after their first in-text mention.	Move each table near its first citation and standardize titles and notes.
T-03	HIGH	The abstract omits sample, fieldwork period and analysis approach.	Add a concise method sentence and state the central finding without excessive detail.
T-04	MODERATE	Two keywords repeat phrases already present in the title.	Choose complementary concepts that improve indexing and discovery.
T-05	MODERATE	Figure 1 is low resolution and uses inconsistent axis and arrow labels.	Reproduce it as vector artwork or at least 300 dpi and standardize label language.
T-06	LOW	Author contribution and data availability statements are absent.	Use the target journal's CRediT and data availability templates.

Target journal alignment notes

- The main text is within the word limit, but table notes and supplementary material should be separated.
- Affiliations and author identifiers must be removed completely from the blinded review file.
- The abstract and keywords need a final check against the journal's English style preferences.



3. Reference and DOI verification

In-text citations were compared with the reference list, and DOI and link fields were technically screened. Missing sources are never invented and unresolved DOI records are not guessed.

48 Total references	7 Apparently missing DOI	5 Verifiable DOI located	3 Citations missing from list
------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------

Record	Status	Review note
R-07 / Author A et al., 2021	CORRECT	A DOI was located and should be added in https://doi.org/ format.
R-19 / Author B, 2019	AUTHOR CHECK	No reliable DOI match was found using the title and journal details.
R-26 / Author C and Author D, 2022	CORRECT	Volume and issue fields are reversed; the page range is missing.
In-text / Author E, 2020	MISSING SOURCE	The citation appears in the text but has no reference-list entry.
R-41 / Author F et al., 2023	NOT CITED	The reference is listed, but no matching in-text citation was found.

Items requiring author judgement: For two unresolved records, the original publication file or a library record should be checked by the author.

4. Separate editorial report: methods and literature

This section does not rewrite the manuscript for the author. It records visible inconsistencies, reporting risks and questions requiring the author's scientific judgement in a separate, traceable form.

Methodological observations

M-01	Research model The authenticity-satisfaction-revisit sequence is explicit in the hypotheses, but direct and indirect effects are not separated in the analysis section.
M-02	Sampling Convenience sampling is stated, but field site, dates, eligibility conditions and rejected responses are not reported.
M-03	Measurement The scale adaptation process is unclear; translation, pilot testing and item-removal decisions should be documented.
M-04	Analysis report Reliability values are reported, but the rationale for discriminant validity and model-fit criteria is missing.

Literature positioning observations

L-01	Research gap Conducting the study in one destination is presented as the sole theoretical gap. The mechanism and boundary condition need clarification.
L-02	Currency Studies from the last three years are listed, but their findings are not synthesized thematically.
L-03	Conceptual boundary Authenticity, locality and traditionality are used interchangeably in places; their distinctions should be preserved.
L-04	Contribution claim The practical contribution is clear, while the theoretical contribution remains general and does not state which relationship is extended.

Questions for the author

- What is the central mechanism through which perceived authenticity is expected to affect satisfaction?
- Under what condition does the destination context strengthen or limit that mechanism?
- If an indirect effect is claimed, do the analysis plan and hypothesis language express it consistently?

5. Prioritized action plan and delivery structure

Stage	Action	Responsibility
1 - Critical	Resolve citation-reference differences; complete sampling and analysis reporting	Author + AcademicFix technical check
2 - Structural	Align the research gap, conceptual mechanism and hypothesis sequence	Author / research team
3 - Format	Apply heading, table, figure, declaration and journal-template requirements	AcademicFix formatting
4 - Final check	Recheck citations, DOI, page structure and submission files after revision	AcademicFix + author approval

Deliverables in this illustrative scope

- Marked Word file or technical correction log
- Reference and DOI verification record
- Separate methods and literature editorial report
- Target-journal pre-submission checklist
- One technical recheck within the agreed scope

Ethical service boundary

AcademicFix does not write manuscripts, theses or assignments; invent data or sources; or make scientific decisions on the author's behalf. Recommendations are evaluated by the author and, where appropriate, the supervisor or research team. Publication acceptance is never guaranteed.

For a file-specific scope: info@academicfix.com