

Paper: “**How lead generation can be the link between marketing and sales through the customer experience? A case study of Talentia Software Italy**”

Submitted: 30 November 2020

Accepted: 07 December 2020

Published: 31 December 2020

Corresponding Author: Arianna Di Vittorio

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n34p45

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Pierluigi Passaro
University of Bari Aldo Moro, Italy

Reviewer 4: Nebo Gerald N.
Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Nigeria

Reviewer 5: Nasreen Khan
SZABIST, Dubai

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 1/12/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 2/12/2020
Manuscript Title: Lead generation as a link between Marketing and Sales. An Italian case history: Talentia Software Italy	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1258/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>(The title can be more specific)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Structure abstract, use short sentences)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Satisfactory on this point)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>(The researchers need to mention the methodology clearly)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>(As the researchers have not defined the research questions, the results do not indicate any specific direction.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported	

by the content.	
<i>Same as above.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(The references listed do not match with the in – text citations as the researcher has hardly included any citations)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper must be formatted properly. Use of italics and footnotes should be avoided unless it is allowed by the publication. The font color should be consistent. Secondly, the paper lacks rigor, as the literature is weak and poorly synthesized.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: PASSARO PIERLUIGI	
University/Country: UNIVERSITY OF BARI ALDO MORO	
Date Manuscript Received: 01.12.20	Date Review Report Submitted: 02.12.20
Manuscript Title: Lead generation as a link between Marketing and Sales. An Italian case history: Talentia Software Italy	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1258/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript is well done, correct and with an adequate methodology.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: DR NEBO GERALD. N	Email:
University/Country: DEPARTMENT OF MARKETING, ENUGU STATE UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, ENUGU STATE, NIGERIA	
Date Manuscript Received: 1st DEC. 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 8th DEC., 2020
Manuscript Title: LEAD GENERATION As A LINK BETWEEN MARKETING AND SALES. AN ITALIAN CASE HISTORY: TALENTIA SOFTWARE ITALY	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1258/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Rating Result</i></p> <p>[Poor] 1-5</p> <p>[Excellent]</p>
------------------	--

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments) THE TITLE IS EXCELLENT AND APPROPRIATE TO THE CONTENT OF THE ARTICLE.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PAPER, THE METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS OF THE STUDY WERE CLEARLY STATED IN THE ABSTRACT.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) THE ARTICLE CONTAINS FEW GRAMMATICAL ERRORS AND SPELLING MISTAKES</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) THE METHODOLOGY IS QUITE CLEAR</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) THE RESULTS ARE ALSO CLEARLY STATED</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) THE CONCLUSIONS ARE UNAMBIGUOUS</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments) THE REFERENCING STYLE IS APPROPRIATE AND WELL-PRESENTED</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	Accept
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): None

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: Accept and publish the paper