

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 23-02-2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 01-03-2017
Manuscript Title: <b>ALLIANCE MANAGEMENT</b> <b>AS SOURCE OF A SUCCESSFUL STRATEGY</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0306/17	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Title is clear, keywords present problems: redundancy of word “alliance” makes five keyword, in the end of the day, only one.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Beware of the use of saxon’s genitive (‘)</i>	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>Not explained at all</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Not really, it is more a recap of what was stated before.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Very outdated</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	<b>x</b>
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Dear author, even though the topic is interesting and up to date, the paper presents several minor and major lacks. Starting from the fact it has no important parts like methodology, or limitations, I noticed an obsolete bibliography, where most of your 60+ titles (!!!) are older than 15 years, despite the initial declaration. It is basically a compilatory work, that reduce the interests for scholars and my warmly expressed suggestion is to use it as fundamental basis for a deeper academic research in order to suggest a robust and consistent hypothesis based on this analytical work. See in detail my critique.

Bibliographic references are somehow and somewhere inconsistent. The first sentence of the paper is: "In the past decades, the importance of strategic alliances substantially increased (Dyer et al., 2001)" referenced by a paper/book that refers in the best case to TWO decades ago

It is used a footnote (1) that is strongly recommended to remove, being a part of the introduction itself and not recommended at all to leave in this form

I do suggest to inform readers about the adopted methodology, it is unclear if it is quantitative (no data, basically) or qualitative (no interviews as well), even though I do recommend at least the second one. It is more like a compilatory work based on a case history, not a robust add on to research.

The paper presents the lack of a strong structure of research, there is no educated question, methodology, literature review, hypothesis, limitations, so it force me to define it a compilatory report, that reduce its importance. It would be better to use it as proof for an hypothesis, that leaving in this state, since some lesson can be taken from it.

## Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Bibliographic references are somehow and somewhere inconsistent. The first sentence of the paper is: “In the past decades, the importance of strategic alliances substantially increased (Dyer et al., 2001)” referenced by a paper/book that refers in the best case to TWO decades ago. A robust revision of bibliographic references is absolutely mandatory.

It is used a footnote (1) that is strongly recommended to remove, being a part of the introduction itself and not recommended at all to leave in this form

I do suggest to inform readers about the adopted methodology, it is unclear if it is quantitative (no data, basically) or qualitative (no interviews as well), even though I do recommend at least the second one. It is more like a compilatory work based on a case history, not a robust add on to research.

Bibliographic resources are inadequate: 7 out of 60 (!!!) are post 2010, only 2 after 2015. The great part is really obsolete (before 2000) and used not in generalist way. I suggest a strong revision.

The paper presents the lack of a strong structure of research, there is no educated question, methodology, literature review, hypothesis, limitations, so it force me to define it a compilatory report, that reduce its importance. It would be better to use it as proof for an hypothesis, that leaving in this state, since some lesson can be taken from it.

Sadly, this work is very far from being scholarly interesting.

