

## Correspondence International Journal of Tourism Cities

**From:** hera.oktadiana@jcu.edu.au

**To:** nengah.aristana@triatmamulya.ac.id

**CC:**

**Subject:** International Journal of Tourism Cities - Decision on Manuscript ID IJTC-03-2021-0036

**Body:** 31-Mar-2021

Dear Dr. Aristana,

Manuscript ID IJTC-03-2021-0036 entitled "Employee Loyalty during Slowdown of Covid 19: Does Satisfaction and Trust Matter?" which you submitted to the International Journal of Tourism Cities, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have different opinion on the paper. I would like however, to give you an opportunity to revise your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ijtc> and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

**IMPORTANT:** Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the International Journal of Tourism Cities, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the International Journal of Tourism Cities and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Yours sincerely,  
Assoc. Prof. Hera Oktadiana, CHE  
Guest Editor, International Journal of Tourism Cities  
hera.oktadiana@jcu.edu.au

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:  
Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Reject

Comments:  
The paper did not match with the journal's objective, it is not oriented the urban tourism and

tourism cities. This paper is focusing on the HR aspect of hotel employees which is more suitable for hospitality journals. Yet, the paper should be revised prior to further submission.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: To a certain extent. The employed constructs are well examined within the field, yet the findings reflect the COVID-19 situation, which would be beneficial to the field.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: The author included an adequate amount of recent literature, however, the connections between each literature are missing.

I would suggest the author insert a visual diagram to illustrate the proposed framework and corresponding hypotheses of this study.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Justification is needed on why discharged respondents are selected? Why current workers are not included in the study? The author mentioned accidental sampling, but the questionnaire was distributed through the networking method. Why is it snowball sampling?

In the abstract, it is mentioned that "distributing questionnaires to 211 employees of the 94 hotels" but later the completed surveys is 206. While it is not incorrect, it causes inconsistency.

How was the measured item asked? or how was the measured item evaluated? 7-point likert scale?

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Justification for using 30 respondents for validity and reliability testing is needed. with reference.

Descriptive analysis such as the mean score of the measured items is needed to provide more information.

The author has provided detailed reporting of the results, however, more discussion of these results is required. For instance, besides confirming with previous literature, how this finding elicit more knowledge, insight, and the phenomenon of employees' loyalty to the company.

5. Contributions to urban and city research literature and practice: Does the paper make a meaningful and significant contribution to the research literature on urban and city tourism? Is the paper likely to have practical value to city tourism practitioners?: Sadly no, the paper very much emphasizes the leader-employee relation. The author didn't extend the findings into the area of urban and city tourism.

6. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: The author listed the potential contribution with little explanation. It would be better if examples or more illustrations could be given to all the four managerial implications.

7. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc?: Editorial service is highly recommended.

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Major Revision

Comments:

1. The gaps presented in the literature is rather vague, and provides little evidence as to

support the claims that the authors make. It is highly recommended that the authors narrow down and specify what the gap is, rather than simply stating that the discussions of hotel business problems has not been carried out systematically and deeply.

"Along with developing the tourism business, the various empirical literature has examined various aspects that can improve human resources competence to provide services that refer to international standards (Astutiet al., 2018; Hewagamaet al., 2019). Nevertheless, the literature that discusses the hotel business problems has not been carried out systematically and deeply. As a result, several problems emerged, such as the role of leadership (Afsar and Umrani, 2019), human resource management" P2L13-23

2. Similarly, the four justification for legitimizing the present study needs to be reworked. The lack of studies in a particular field does not automatically grant access for legitimizing a study. Instead, the rationale of the study and the gaps presented in the literature needs to be carefully thought and properly founded. It would be best for the authors to explain WHY these relationships are important and worth examining. Additionally, they might want to refer to previous studies and explain what was found / not found, and present inconsistencies reported in the literature, explain these discrepancies and propose how they would solve these discrepancies.

3. The authors mentioned that the model is based on social exchange theory, yet there is very limited discussion of this in the literature review. It would best if the authors could further enhance this part of the literature review by: 1) defining the social exchange theory; 2) explaining how it applies in the present research and how each of the concepts in the study fit into the current model.

4. The mediating role of employee trust and employee satisfaction is not very clear. Some of these aspects discussed in the literature are far fetch and is hardly related to the present context.

5. The authors used snow ball sampling ("One of the researchers' efforts to distribute questionnaires in pandemic Covid-19 conditions was through the networking method, namely asking respondents to redistribute the questionnaire to their colleagues" P5L38-42).

6. I am a bit surprised by the number of hotels that were approached for the sample that the authors obtained. It was almost a ratio of 2 employees per hotel. Please provide some details regarding the hotels that were sampled (how many employees per hotel, the star rating of the sampled hotels) and what was the inclusion criteria.

7. It would be better to present demographic information of participants in the results section, as a separate subsection entitled "Descriptive / Demographic information" (instead of presenting it in the methodology section). In addition to the short paragraph describing the demographic data, it would be helpful to the reader to provide further insights if additional demographic information is presented in a table.

8. When reporting the results, it should be purely descriptive, reporting only what was found. The explanation of results should be included in the discussion, so as to whether the results contradict or corroborate evidence from past research.

9. Leader Support → Employee Loyalty was not supported. Please elaborate on the explanations as to why these are not related, as the current explanation is limited and unclear (as reported on P.8L.23-25).

10. Social Exchange theory not properly discussed in the discussion. The study was based on the social exchange theory, yet there is limited discussion of the results in relation to that.

11. Caution needs to be exercised when providing managerial recommendations and suggestions that go beyond what was found. None of the variables relate to technological adoptions, yet the authors suggest "adopting technology to increase employee productivity" (P.8L44-45). Other examples relate to empowerment that was not measured in the present study and was included as a recommendation for managerial implication "This role can be realized through various supports for employees, such as freedom of work autonomy, opportunities to participate, respecting employees' ideas and knowledge (Arsawan et al., 2020)." (P.8L40-43). Additionally, it would be expected that the implications are directly related to the COVID19, yet none of the practical implications suggested by the authors refers to the pandemic outbreak.

12. It is odd when the aim of the present study is to examine the proposed research model in the specific context of COVID19, and yet, the authors suggest that this is a limitation of research? This appears to be contradictory...

13. The writing appears to be choppy at times, it is recommended that the authors work on the transitions to improve the fluency and readability of the manuscript.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The topic under discussion is novel and is worth looking into.
2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Yes, the literature review is comprehensive, yet the framework that the study was based on (social exchange theory) is not clearly explained and needs to be further elaborated.
3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: There are some aspects of the methodology that needs to be revised as detailed below.
4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Yes
5. Contributions to urban and city research literature and practice: Does the paper make a meaningful and significant contribution to the research literature on urban and city tourism? Is the paper likely to have practical value to city tourism practitioners?: No. Please see my comments below.
6. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: No. Please see my comments below.
7. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc?: Only minor issues, though the authors may want to improve the transition between sections.

Reviewer: 3

Recommendation: Major Revision

Comments:

Appreciation to the author(s) who actively make a research and wrote an article that relates with the pandemic Covid-19 on hospitality industry in Indonesia. Need explanation from the author(s) why he/she investigating employee loyalty to the hotel, in the middle of the pandemic where hotels are layings-off many of their employees.

Please pay attention to my comments and revise accordingly.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes. Appreciation to the author(s) who actively make a research and wrote an article that relates with the pandemic Covid-19 on hospitality industry in Indonesia.

However, the author(s) have to add more explanation why he/she investigating employee loyalty to the hotel, in the middle of the pandemic where hotels are layings-off many of their employees.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Yes. However, there are brave statements made by the author(s). The author(s) claim for several times that there are no previous research regarding these variables:

a. Most empirical studies on employee loyalty only focus on the banking sector (Lamberti, 2021; Narteh and Odoom, 2015) and SME (Gandhi et al., 2018). Thus, this study is one of the first studies to examine the determinants of loyalty in hotel industry employees.==> page 2 line 31-33

b. There is no research linking leaders' role with trust and employee satisfaction in measuring employee loyalty (Yue et al., 2019; Zeffane and Melhem, 2017) \ page line 36-38

The statement is quite brave, I just want to make sure that the author(s) have done a prudent exploration prior of giving this statement.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: There are some points that needs to be clarify regarding the methodology: Hypotheses Development: The author(s) have to check H8: Employee satisfaction as a mediator for the effect of employee trust on employee loyalty. Is this hypotheses correct? Or there is a typo? Since in the research result part, it is actually: Employee trust as a mediator for the effect of leader support on employee loyalty.

Sampling method (page 5 line 34-39): This study's population was hotel employees spread across nine districts/cities in Bali, Indonesia. This study uses a questionnaire as a data collection tool. The questionnaire was distributed to hotel employees who have at least one year of work experience and are currently being discharged due to the Covid 19 pandemic.

My question is, the respondents are the employee who are being discharged during the pandemic. Won't this situation affecting the respondents' responses?

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Result of hypothesis testing on hypothesis 3 (page 7 line 9-11), where leader support has no significant effect on employee loyalty with a path coefficients value of 0.091 and p-value 0.093 (H3 not supported). This result contradict the study results by Wang, Lu, and Liu (2017) that employee loyalty refers to behavior to engage in organizational interests.

For this result, the author(s) explains that it happens because in the hotel business, top management is not directly involved in hotel operations. In operational activities, employees have more attachment to middle leaders, such as department heads or supervisors. Thus, employees cannot directly feel the support from the top leaders from the operational side. I suggest that the author(s) find other rationales that might come from previous researches or other analysis, because in some hotels, top management has a system to engage their employees.

5. Contributions to urban and city research literature and practice: Does the paper make a meaningful and significant contribution to the research literature on urban and city tourism? Is the paper likely to have practical value to city tourism practitioners?: In my opinion, this paper is more focus into the hospitality industry.

6. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Yes, however there is a contradiction between the findings and implication as reflected in the abstract part:

Page 1 Line 16-19: Findings: The results revealed that leader support did not have a significant effect on employee loyalty. Satisfaction and trust act as double mediators in leaders' support and loyalty relationships.

But on the Research limitations and implications, the author(s) stated that Employees need leaders' support to remain loyal to their organization in a slowdown situation due to the Covid 19 pandemic and its various challenges.

Please check again this analysis so that it will be in line with the research results. Or, perhaps the author(s) want to add more explanation on this?

7. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc?: Yes, the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership.

This paper also has a good clarity and readability.

## Minor Revision

14-Jun-2021

Dear Dr. I Nengah Aristana,

Manuscript ID IJTC-03-2021-0036.R1 entitled "Employee Loyalty during Slowdown of Covid 19: Does Satisfaction and Trust Matter?" which you submitted to the International Journal of Tourism Cities, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have suggested some minor revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ijtc> and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text.

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

**IMPORTANT:** Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the International Journal of Tourism Cities, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the International Journal of Tourism Cities and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Yours sincerely,  
Assoc. Prof. Hera Oktadiana, CHE  
Guest Editor, International Journal of Tourism Cities  
[hera.oktadiana@jcu.edu.au](mailto:hera.oktadiana@jcu.edu.au)

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:  
Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:  
Please see above.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes
2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Yes
3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: I appreciate the authors' efforts in revising and justifying their research approach. It would be great for authors to further explain why the score interpretation is maximized at 5 while the Likert scale is 7-point. Why not just

employed the original point scale that is maxed at 7?

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Yes

5. Contributions to urban and city research literature and practice: Does the paper make a meaningful and significant contribution to the research literature on urban and city tourism? Is the paper likely to have practical value to city tourism practitioners?: The connection is still rather weak. The paper is much hospitality oriented, and the authors have not demonstrated the linkage of how their research value add to the urban and tourism city. The paper shows the contribution to the hotel industry, it needs to further illustrate how the findings contribute to the city. Or how does this finding affect the hotel industry that further affects the city development.

6. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Yes

7. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc?: Yes

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:

First of all, the authors should be more considerate when they indicate that revisions were made and marked in yellow. This should indeed accurately reflect that changes that were made, which is often not the case when compared to the original document (on some instances).

Second, the mediating role of employee trust and employee satisfaction is still not clear to me. How would this further explain the relationship between leader support and employee loyalty? The examples borrowed from the marketing literature does not appear to be adequate and is hardly related to what the authors wish to investigate.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: See comments below

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: See comments below

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: See comments below

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: See comments below

5. Contributions to urban and city research literature and practice: Does the paper make a meaningful and significant contribution to the research literature on urban and city tourism? Is the paper likely to have practical value to city tourism practitioners?: See comments below

6. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: See comments below

7. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc?: See comments below

Reviewer: 3



Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:

Kindly refer to the comments.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Done. The author(s) have add more explanation why he/she investigating employee loyalty to the hotel, in the middle of the pandemic where hotels are laying-off many of their employees.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Done. The author has revised the research gap (Introduction section, page 2).

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: The respond for this question still need to be clarify. Kindly make a clearer statement for the statements below:

The author stated: The researchers did not specifically classify the respondents, given the situation during the pandemic. However, in general, the targets for filling out the questionnaire were employees who are dismissed. The authors use these employees as research respondents to determine the dedication and integrity of employees towards the company. Also, to obtain information regarding the desire of hotel industry employees to return to work in this sector. It is undeniable that the conditions of the Covid 19 pandemic, which lasted for a long time. Thus, people who work in the tourism sector look for alternative jobs in other sectors. My Question: The respond still do not answer the question if this situation will affecting their respond. My suggestion, perhaps the author(s) can put this as a limitation of the research.

The author stated: The questionnaire was created using google form and distributed using snowball sampling  
My question: What is meant by snow ball sampling? Snow ball technique is usually used for qualitative research.

The author stated: Researchers use this method because they have difficulty identifying employees who are not actively working in the hotel sector.

Finally, the researcher uses several key informants to deliver the researcher to the respondents to be studied. Thus, the presence of these key informants provides data access and helps researchers find other key informants (Burgess, 1982).

My Question: Is this research qualitative, quantitative, or mixed method? The used of informants usually are for qualitative research.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The author has revised and added an explanation for the results of this paper (section 5. Discussion, paragraph 3, page 9). However, it is still need to be supported by a stronger and clearer literature.

5. Contributions to urban and city research literature and practice: Does the paper make a meaningful and significant contribution to the research literature on urban and city tourism? Is the paper likely to have practical value to city tourism practitioners?: The author has added a description of city tourism practitioners in the Introduction (paragraph 3, page 2). Revisions are marked with yellow highlights.

However, it is still need to be clarified:

The author wrote: The pandemic is also a test of employee loyalty to the hotel where they work, particularly in city tourism. It cannot be denied that city tourism experience a bigger pandemic impact than tourism in rural areas.

My questions: Why did the author think so, because the impact of pandemic in resort hotel or rural area actually is bigger than the city area where hotel business can still run from the business traveler guests.

The author also adds an explanation in the Managerial Implication section (paragraph 3, page 11). Revisions are marked with yellow highlights.

The author wrote: The results contribute to other tourism business managers, particularly in city tourism. It cannot be denied that city tourism experience a bigger pandemic impact than tourism in rural areas.

My questions: Kindly check the statement again because many tourism business in rural areas are more suffered because usually rural tourism are dependent on tourists (international or domestic). With restrictions for travelers, many rural tourism areas can not have any business at all. While the tourism business in the city can still receive guests from business sectors.

6. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Done. The author has revised the Implication section (on pages 10-11) Revisions are marked with yellow highlights.

7. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc?: No revision.

To help support you on your publishing journey we have partnered with Editage, a leading global science communication platform, to offer expert editorial support including language editing and translation.

If your article has been rejected or revisions have been requested, you may benefit from Editage's services. For a full list of services, visit: [authorservices.emeraldpublishing.com/](https://authorservices.emeraldpublishing.com/)

Please note that there is no obligation to use Editage and using this service does not guarantee publication.

Accepted



**International Journal of Tourism Cities**

Inbox - Google 11 July 2021 16:02

International Journal of Tourism Cities - Decision on Manuscript ID IJTC-03-2021-0036.R3

To: nengah.aristana@triarmamulya.ac.id, wayanediarsawan@pnb.ac.id, rusti\_arini@unmas.ac.id,

Reply-To: hera.oktadiana@jcu.edu.au

11-Jul-2021

Dear Aristana, I Nengah; Arsawan, I Wayan Edi; Rustiarini, Ni Wayan

It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript IJTC-03-2021-0036.R3, entitled "Employee Loyalty during Slowdown of Covid 19: Do Satisfaction and Trust Matter?" in its current form for publication in International Journal of Tourism Cities. Please note, no further changes can be made to your manuscript.

Please go to your Author Centre at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ijtc> (Manuscripts with Decisions for the submitting author or Manuscripts I have co-authored for all listed co-authors) to complete the Copyright Transfer Agreement form (CTA). We cannot publish your paper without this.

All authors are requested to complete the form and to input their full contact details. If any of the contact information is incorrect you can update it by clicking on your name at the top right of the screen. Please note that this must be done prior to you submitting your CTA.

If you have an ORCID please check your account details to ensure that your ORCID is validated.

By publishing in this journal your work will benefit from Emerald EarlyCite. As soon as your CTA is completed your manuscript will pass to Emerald's Content Management department and be processed for EarlyCite publication. EarlyCite is the author proofed, typeset version of record, fully citable by DOI. The EarlyCite article sits outside of a journal issue and is paginated in isolation. The EarlyCite article will be collated into a journal issue according to the journals' publication schedule.

FOR OPEN ACCESS AUTHORS: Please note if you have indicated that you would like to publish your article as Open Access via Emerald's Gold Open Access route, you are required to complete a Creative Commons Attribution Licence - CCBY 4.0 (in place of the standard copyright assignment form referenced above). You will receive a follow up email within the next 30 days with a link to the CCBY licence and information regarding payment of the Article Processing Charge. If you have indicated that you might be eligible for a prepaid APC voucher, you will also be informed at this point if a voucher is available to you (for more information on APC vouchers please see <http://www.emeraldpublishing.com/oapartnerships>)

Thank you for your contribution. On behalf of the Editors of International Journal of Tourism Cities, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Yours sincerely,  
Assoc. Prof. Hera Oktadiana, CHE  
Guest Editor, International Journal of Tourism Cities  
[hera.oktadiana@jcu.edu.au](mailto:hera.oktadiana@jcu.edu.au)