

CERTIFICATION for the PEER REVIEW PROCESS &
EVALUATION of the PEER REVIEW PROCESS &
CERTIFICATION for NON EXISTENCE of ARTIFICIAL CITATIONS
and ANTI-PLAGIARISM CONTROL

Name: CHARA KOTTARA

Institution: University of West Attica

City Athens

Country Greece

Phone:0330-6940938927

Academic Email: hkottara@uniwa.gr

I declare, I confirm, I certify and I sign that I received substantial, important, line by line peer review with several and substantial comments, important remarks and hints from, at least, 3 Reviewers and the Assistant Editor for my paper:

Determining the Factors of Leadership Behavior in Hotel Enterprises: The Case of Greece

with Authors:

MARIA LAGOU¹, CHARA KOTTARA, ANTHI GOUSIOU, GRIGORIS L.
KYRIAKOPOULOS⁴

I would like to thank all the reviewers for their thoughtful comments and efforts towards improving our manuscript. We revised the manuscript with special attention to the comments that we received from **Three (3)** reviewers that were experts, specialists in the area of my paper. I declare, confirm, certify and sign that WSEAS has checked my paper for possible plagiarism by Turnitin and my paper was found without plagiarism or self-plagiarism by Turnitin. I also declare, confirm, certify and sign that also that no Associate-Editor, no Editor-in-Chief, no member of the WSEAS Secretariat forced me in this Journal to add references (citations) to any previous publications of the journal.

I also declare, confirm, certify and sign that I have made all the changes, modifications, additions, studies, corrections asked by the reviewers and I have fully complied with their instructions. I also understand that before the publication the 3 (or more than 3) reviewers will check my paper to see if all the changes, modifications, additions, studies, corrections etc have been done and I authorize the WSEAS to publish my paper or to reject my paper even in the 2nd round of peer review or to continue with an additional round of peer review.

I also declare, I confirm, I certify and I sign that I will not publish this paper or an important part of the paper in any other Journal (inside or outside WSEAS) Conference Proceedings (inside or outside WSEAS), Book (inside or outside WSEAS), University Repository etc) without the written permission of the WSEAS.

I also declare, I confirm, I certify and I sign that this paper or an important part of the paper has not been published other Journal (inside or outside WSEAS) Conference Proceedings (inside or outside WSEAS), Book (inside or outside WSEAS), University Repository etc). In case of violation of the above terms, WSEAS can reject any unpublished paper or even retract any published paper.

Please, write additional comments below (take ideas from:
<http://wseas.org/main/author-testimonials.html>)

Signature (insert an image file with scanned signature or print out the whole page, sign and scan)

Δρ. Κοτταρά Χάρυ



Date: 17/8/2026

Reviewer1

The authors should therefore ensure that all tables and figures are included in the final manuscript and that numerical values reported in the text correspond exactly to the values shown in the tables. Figure 1 is referred to as a “Krimnogram,” which appears to be an incorrect translation or terminology issue; “Scree Plot” would be the standard term in factor analysis. Several grammatical and typographical issues should be corrected. Examples include “leadership behavior affected to behavior of administrative executives” which should be revised to “leadership behavior affected the behavior of administrative executives”; “addict to leadership behavior” in the limitations section should be corrected to “contribute to leadership behavior” or “affect leadership behavior”; “One sample Wilcoxon Singed Rank Test Summary” should be “Signed Rank Test”; “close-dended” should be “close-ended”; “Krimnogram” should be replaced with “Scree Plot”; several instances of awkward phrasing, inconsistent hyphenation, spacing errors, and typographical breaks introduced during formatting should also be corrected throughout the manuscript. The manuscript would benefit from professional English-language editing. The conclusions are generally supported by the empirical findings, although some managerial recommendations extend beyond the evidence generated by the study. The discussion occasionally makes strong claims regarding transformational leadership, charismatic leadership, sustainability, and innovation although these constructs were not directly measured in the questionnaire. Such extrapolations should be moderated or empirically justified. Concerning possible reuse of previously published material, reference [5] is authored by some of the same authors and addresses employee motivation in Greek hotel businesses. There is a possibility of overlap in literature review, conceptual framework, questionnaire design, and interpretation of results. The manuscript should therefore be carefully screened for self-plagiarism and redundant publication. The authors should explicitly state whether the questionnaire items, dataset, or any part of the analysis have been previously published and, if so, clearly identify the novel contribution of the present study. It can be accepted after major revision.

Dear Reviewer 1,

Thank you very much for your insightful comments and feedback. We have thoroughly corrected all grammatical and typographical issues and the manuscript has undergone comprehensive English-language editing for improved clarity and diligence. All tables and figures are included in the final manuscript and that numerical values reported in the text correspond exactly to the values shown in the tables. Furthermore, all conclusions or claims that were not directly measured or supported by the questionnaire data have been eliminated. Regarding reference [5], we would like to clarify that although it represents published research examining employee motivation within Greek hotel businesses utilizing factor analysis, it shares no methodological or empirical alignment with the present study. The research hypotheses, conceptual frameworks and empirical findings are fundamentally distinct. Our study merely utilizes certain conceptual statements from reference [5] for literature positioning. We categorically assure that the questionnaire items, dataset and all subsequent parts of the analysis are entirely original and have not been previously published elsewhere.

Reviewer2

This is a mediocre paper. The authors should clarify how their contribution advances existing knowledge beyond previous studies on hotel leadership and employee motivation. Concerning methodology, the sample size calculation section contains inconsistencies. Equations appear to be missing from the manuscript text, and the numbering of equations is problematic. Equation

references (3) and (5) appear without the complete mathematical expressions being visible in the manuscript. The numbering sequence is therefore inconsistent and should be carefully checked. The Cochran sample size calculation should be presented explicitly, including all formulas, intermediate calculations, and justification of parameter selection. Furthermore, the discussion of quota sampling and proportional stratified sampling is confusing because quota sampling is a non-probability technique whereas proportional stratified sampling is generally considered a probability-based approach. The authors should clarify the exact sampling design employed. The factor analysis section contains methodological inconsistencies. In Section 3.7, the manuscript states that the Rotated Component Matrix presents two factors after orthogonal rotation, whereas the results section subsequently identifies four factors. This contradiction should be corrected. The manuscript reports that four factors explain approximately 60% of the variance, which is acceptable; however, additional diagnostic information should be provided, including anti-image matrices, determinant values, scree plot interpretation criteria, factor loading thresholds, cross-loading assessment, and justification for selecting Quartimax rotation instead of Varimax or Oblimin. The factor naming process also appears subjective and requires stronger theoretical justification. The statistical hypothesis testing section requires improvement. The authors perform normality testing on Likert-scale variables and subsequently apply Wilcoxon signed-rank tests. However, the rationale for testing each variable against a median value of 3.7 is not adequately justified. The choice of 3.7 appears arbitrary and should be theoretically or empirically supported. Moreover, multiple testing corrections should be considered because fourteen separate hypothesis tests are conducted. The interpretation of Wilcoxon results is simplistic and should include effect sizes and confidence intervals. Regarding tables and figures, the manuscript refers to Tables 1–9 and Figure 1. The numbering appears sequential and internally consistent within the text. However, because the submitted file contains only table and figure references without the actual tables and figure content being visible, it is impossible to verify whether the data presented in the tables and figure are fully consistent with the narrative discussion. The paper can be accepted after major revision.

Dear Reviewer 2,

Thank you very much for your valuable comments and constructive suggestions. We have carefully addressed all the points raised and the manuscript has been thoroughly revised accordingly. In response to your specific feedback, the following amendments and clarifications have been implemented:

Sampling Methodology (Subsection 3.3): A dedicated subsection has been introduced to detail the non-probability quota sampling method employed for sample selection,

Cochran's Formula & Parameter Justification: Cochran's equation has been recalculated. All statistical parameters (including the Z score for the 95% confidence level and the 8% margin of error) have been thoroughly analysed and justified based on established quantitative research standards.

Factor Analysis Corrections: We have corrected the reporting of our Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). The orthogonal rotation yielded four distinct factors; this has been homogenized and stated clearly in the description throughout the text.

Table Formatting and Visibility: Following your observation regarding the visibility of the statistical output, where it is possible, relevant tables have been manually recreated within

Microsoft Word. This layout replacement ensures maximum clarity and readability within the text column constraints.

Methodological Justification (EFA vs CFA): We would like to clarify that Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was chosen as the primary framework because the underlying latent structure of our dataset was previously unknown. In contrast to Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), which relies on pre-existing theory to validate fixed models, our objective was to inductively discover the core dimensions of leadership behaviour within this specific context.

Extraction and Rotation Techniques: Within the EFA framework, Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was selected for factor extraction to maximize the explained variance and condense the variables. For factor rotation, Varimax with Kaiser normalization was employed instead of alternative oblique or orthogonal techniques (such as Quartimax or Oblimin). This specific approach achieves a "simple structure" by maximizing higher factor loadings and minimizing lower ones, thereby preventing the over-influence of variables with large variances and significantly enhancing conceptual interpretability.

Hypothesis Testing (Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test): The non-parametric One-Sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test confirmed that the sample median ($Md = 4.0$) differs statistically significantly from the hypothesized population reference value of 3.7 ($p < 0.05$) in a two-sided test, ($\alpha = 0.05$). Consequently, the null hypothesis (H_0) was formally rejected, establishing that the true median of the variable within the population is significantly higher than the control value. We believe that these extensive revisions have significantly strengthened the manuscript, and we hope the paper is now suitable for publication.

Reviewer3

The paper addresses a topic of practical relevance in hospitality management; however, in its current form it is not suitable for publication in a WSEAS journal. WSEAS journals primarily focus on applied mathematics, computational science, optimization, statistics, dynamical systems, numerical analysis, mathematical modeling, data science, and mathematically rigorous methodologies. The present manuscript is essentially a management and leadership study employing standard questionnaire-based social science methods, factor analysis, and basic hypothesis testing. So, dear Editor, the statistical procedures are correctly identified as Factor Analysis and Wilcoxon testing, but the mathematical contribution is limited and does not meet the level of methodological novelty, mathematical rigor, theoretical development, or computational innovation normally expected in WSEAS publications. The authors should substantially strengthen the mathematical content by developing a formal mathematical model of leadership behavior, introducing advanced multivariate statistical modeling, structural equation modeling, Bayesian inference, latent variable modeling, machine learning classification techniques, optimization-based decision frameworks, or predictive mathematical models that go beyond descriptive factor extraction. The manuscript is generally well structured, but several language, style, and methodological issues require attention. The literature review is extensive and relatively current; however, it is excessively descriptive and lacks a critical synthesis leading to specific hypotheses grounded in theory. The research gap is not sufficiently justified, particularly because the manuscript claims originality based mainly on nationwide sampling within Greece rather than on theoretical or methodological innovation.

Dear Reviewer 3,

The authors would like to sincerely thank you for your rigorous evaluation of the manuscript and the constructive insights provided. We highly appreciate your recognition that the paper addresses a topic of significant practical relevance within the field of hospitality management. We respectfully acknowledge your concerns regarding the level of mathematical or computational contribution. However, we would like to clarify that the primary objective of this study is not the development of a novel mathematical methodology, but rather the empirical investigation of leadership behaviour factors within luxury hotel enterprises in Greece through a statistically rigorous, quantitative framework. The study deliberately employs established quantitative methods including sample determination via Cochran's formula, scale reliability analysis via Cronbach's alpha, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and non-parametric hypothesis testing via the Wilcoxon signed-rank test. These specific procedures were selected because they align precisely with the exploratory nature of our research, the characteristics of the gathered dataset and the core objectives of the study. The primary contribution of this paper lies in the identification and validation of latent dimensions of leadership behaviour within a comprehensive, nationwide sample. To further clarify this point, additional text has been incorporated into the manuscript to emphasize the exploratory nature of the research and provide a more transparent rationale for our statistical choices. The alternative methodologies you suggested including Structural Equation Modelling (SEM), Bayesian inference, machine learning techniques, predictive modelling, and optimization frameworks represent powerful and widely recognized analytical approaches. Nevertheless, the scope of our research differs fundamentally from the objectives typically addressed by such techniques

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) vs SEM: Structural Equation Modelling is generally employed when a theoretically established causal framework already exists and the primary objective is confirmatory hypothesis testing. In contrast, the current research adopts an exploratory research design aimed at identifying and evaluating the underlying latent dimensions that characterize leadership behaviour in Greek luxury hotels. The study does not seek to confirm an a priori causal model or test a predefined theoretical structure hence, EFA constitutes the most appropriate methodological framework.

Exploratory vs Predictive Models: Machine learning and predictive modelling techniques are uniquely suited for forecasting, classification, or decision automation. Because our research objective is explanatory and exploratory rather than predictive, we firmly believe that the selected classical statistical framework is more consistent with our aims. Therefore, while fully recognizing the value of the suggested advanced methodologies, we respectfully maintain that the adopted framework is suitable for addressing our specific research questions. To enhance the manuscript's clarity, the research objectives have been refined to better demonstrate the logical bridge between the theoretical background and the empirical investigation. We hope that these clarifications and text enhancements successfully address your concerns.