**Series of Studies on Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation**

This Series promotes the publication of books, in Italian or English, focused on the topics of entrepreneurship and social innovation. Each book must be characterized by originality, rigorous method and scientific relevance.

The quality requirements for the books in this Series are evaluated and promoted through a rigorous process of double blind-review. The double-blind review is conducted according to the principles and with the aims of the most modern academic evaluation systems, in order to guarantee the scientific quality based on the following characteristics: topicality of the themes; rigorous methodology; clarity in exposure; relevance and novelty of the references; meaningfulness of the results. The aim of this double-blind review is therefore to guarantee the scientific relevance of the books published in this Series in order to provide a useful contribution to the national and international scientific debate and in order to increase the progress of knowledge on entrepreneurship and social innovation.

The books in this Series may be qualitative or based on empirical research. In the latter, the rigorous reconciliation of empirical results with the theoretical framework of the field (Business Economics; Economics and Business Management; Economic Sociology) is much appreciated in the review process.

**Scientific Director**

Professor Francesco Vermiglio, full professor of Business administration at the University of Messina (Italy)

**Scientific Committee:**

Maria Gabriella Baldarelli (University of Bologna, Italy); Angathevar Baskaran (University of Malaya, Malaysia); Maria Giuseppina Bruna, (IPAG Business School of Paris, France); Antonio Del Pozzo (University of Messina, Italy); Roberto Mavilia (University “Dante Alighieri” of Reggio Calabria, Italy); Vincenzo Morabito (Bocconi University, Italy);

Mammo Muchie (Tshwane University of Technology, Pretoria - South Africa); Domenico Nicolò (University Mediterranea of Reggio Calabria, Italy); Antonio Rafele, (University Paris Descartes La Sorbonne, France); Franco Ernesto Rubino (University of Calabria UNICAL, Italy)

**Drafting Committee:**

Guerino Bovalino; Roberta Pisani; Serena Stilo; Tonia Tassone; Isabella Trombetta; Giuseppe Vacalebre; Giuseppe Valenza.

**Administrative procedures and coordination with the publishing house**

For the administrative and coordination issues with the publisher, a support work is provided by MEDAlics Research Centre of the University "Dante Alighieri" of Reggio Calabria. MEDAlics may also provide grants to cover the costs for books focused on the main topics of this Research Centre.

# Series of studies on entrepreneurship and social innovation

**Review process**

The books of this Series are printed by the publishing house “FrancoAngeli”.

For publication in this Series there is a double blind-review process.

In order to start the review process, the author must send the full text, in pdf format, to the Email address [collana@medalics.org](mailto:collana@medalics.org) to Scientific Director’s attention.

This full paper must be anonymous, without any reference (including notes and cross-references) that may create a connection between the book proposal and author(s). In case of a book written by several authors, corresponding author will be in charge to send the proposal and of any communication.

The Scientific Director communicates to the Scientific Committee the receipt of the book proposal, attaching short explanatory sheet on the proposal (Title, Objectives, Content, Index) and express decision regarding the start of review process on the basis of the coherence of the topics covered with the themes of the Series and of a first preliminary judgement on the overall quality of the written book. In case of disagreement, the Scientific Director will send to the Scientific Committee a full copy of the book and the decision (start or denial of the review process) will be made with an absolute majority.

Once the preliminary procedures have been completed, the Scientific Director will send the book without names to two reviewers, who may be chosen within the Scientific Committee or outside it (among Academics with adequate expertise on the topics covered in the book).

The reviewers will be in charge to evaluate based on the following areas:

1. relevance of the topic for this Series;

2. suitability, clarity and comprehensibility of the language with respect to the disciplinary reference field;

3. relevance and topicality of the topic;

4. methodological rigour;

5. relevance and novelty of the references;

6. scientific value, in terms of contribution to the progress of knowledge on the subject.

The reviewers will make a recommendation for or against publication and, if necessary, with suggestions for further improvements for a second assessment step.

If both reviewers express a positive opinion without any suggestions for revision, the book will be published.

If one or both reviewers propose corrections, the Scientific Director forwards the suggestions to the author. In case of a positive evaluation, the printing procedures start. If the second evaluation is not satisfactory, the book is not accepted for publication.

In case of differing opinions of the two reviewers, the book will be submitted to a third reviewer and it will be accepted or rejected on the basis of the prevalence of the opinions obtained (two out of three).

The review form is attached.

**Review form**

**Evaluations, comments and suggestions**

Book title:

Reviewer N.

(N.B. - The "Comments" boxes are freely editable for the considerations that the reviewer intends to propose on each evaluation profile)

**1. Is the topic of book relevant to entrepreneurship and social innovation?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1= low | | | | | 10 = high | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Comments**

**2. Is there a correct use in the text of technical terms related to the disciplinary context of the book? Is the form of presentation clear and comprehensible?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1= low | | | | | 10 = high | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Comments**

**3. Is the subject matter topical in business economics studies and/or relevant to the current scientific debate?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1= low | | | | | 10 = high | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Comments**

**4. Does the text have a good methodological rigour (Coherence of the arguments with respect to the title; Logical coherence of the structure of the text; Logical coherence within the different parts of the text? References relevant to the literature? Appropriate use of statistical models for possible empirical analysis?)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1= low | | | | | 10 = high | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Comments**

**5. Are the references on which the research is based relevant and up to date to adequately express the state of the art of the literature on the subject?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1= low | | | | | 10 = high | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Comments**

**6. Are the results of the empirical surveys traced back to the theoretical frameworks of disciplines?** (Only if the book presents results of empirical investigations)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1= low | | | | | 10 = high | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Comments**

**7. On the basis of the assessments made with reference to the individual profiles, can the book be considered as scientifically relevant?** (On this point express only a quantitative evaluation)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1= low | | | | | 10 = high | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**The final proposal of the reviewer, taking into account all the assessments made, is:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **A) Accept for publication** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **B) Request minor revisions[[1]](#footnote-1)\*** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **C) Request major revisions\*** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **D) Reject** |

**\* Suggestions for changes (proposals B and C)**

**Comments for the Scientific Committee. (The comments in this section will not be disclosed to the author).**

Place and date…………………………………………… Signature. ………………………………….

1. \* The suggestions must be summarized in the box below the list of proposals [↑](#footnote-ref-1)