Paper: **"The Successor Training as a Success Factor in the Management and Continuity of the Family Business"**

Corresponding Author: Luz Del Carmen Garcia Arrollo

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Marco Tulio CerónLópez
Universidad IEU (Instituto de EstudiosUniversitarios), México

Reviewer 2: Raúl Rocha Romero
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Reviewer 3: Enriko Ceko
Wisdom University, Albania

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: Marco Tulio CerónLópez	Email:
University/Country: Universidad IEU (Instituto de EstudiosUniversitarios) / México	
Date Manuscript Received:21/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/10/2020
Manuscript Title: The Successor Training as a Success Factor in the Management and Continuity of the Family Business	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1103/20	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**

(Please insert your comments) **There is a clear relationship between the title of the paper and the development of it.**	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
(Please insert your comments) **Yes, they are clear**	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
(Please insert your comments) **There are no errors, it is written correctly**	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
(Please insert your comments) **The study methods, if they are clearly explained.**	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**5**
(Please insert your comments) **There are no errors, it is written correctly**	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
(Please insert your comments) **The results are clear and are explained in the body of the paper.**	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	

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):

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: Raúl Rocha Romero	Email:
University/Country: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México/México	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/10/2020
Manuscript Title: **The Successor Training as a Success Factor in the Management and Continuity of the Family Business**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 03.11.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: **Yes**/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:**Yes**/No You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: **Yes**/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
The title is clear and eloquent.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**
Does not mention the instruments with which the data was collected. *Explain in theoretical terms and say if the results found are statistically significant.*	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
The article does not contain errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
The methodology is clearly presented. *The statistical part is relevant and very well presented.*	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**5**
The article is very good and does not contain errors	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
The conclusions are brief but congruent with the text.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
A good search for appropriate references to the topic is appreciated.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1)   Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.
In the text they write "Main Text", I suggest they write a suitable title.

(2)   Changes which must be made before publication
Correct the abstract with what is indicated.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The article is very good. Take care of only the question of the format.

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: 29ᵗʰ October 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 31ˢᵗ October 2020
Manuscript Title: The Successor Training as a Success Factor in the Management and Continuity of the Family Business	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 03.11.2020	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
The title fits very well with the content of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	**4**

results.	
Some clarification is needed about the methodology and methods used (One sentence of what is written at Methodology part of the article) , while in the abstract authors goes directly to information about data collection, etc…	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**No**
There are not grammatical errors and spelling mistakes.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**Yes**
There is a clear explanation of what is supposed to have been done, but when we go on the questions side, only questions 3 and 8 are declared in the body of the paper research, while Appendixes of the article is missing, where authors must show the questionnaire, without any doubt on that. I stress, they must. In case they fail to include questionnaire in appendixes, that the article should be rejected.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
There is no need to include references in introduction. Introduction is a part of the research that expresses the general content of the paper and thoughts of authors, and / or general overview about the topic. So, authors might see useful to make a general overview about the issue in place where they have written references. For example at I, II and III paragraph of the introduction, authors should change references in (….) with their views and thoughts, while using these references in the body of the article, as appropriate.	
The table prepared by authors, just explain in a plain mode what in fact should be traced in a time frame perspective. Saying that, bringing the table in a time mode perspective listing thoughts of authors they have referred adding to them their findings starting from the early references (Gallo - 1998) to the last ones (Schlepporst and Moog – 2014), brings to the audience the flow of the issue. At this point I stress, a fresher literature of last 1 - 3 years is needed, as a fourth line of the table.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
The conclusions are accurate, but not supported by content because explanation about questions 1,2,4,5,6,7 and possible questions after question nr 8, are not included in the main text and questions are not listed in appendixes.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**No.**
The references are appropriate, but not comprehensive. In fact, few references are comprehensive (only 3) and them not main references used. This because in literature, the issue of successor training is missing recently. There are not sufficient opportunities in literature for such subject.	

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):

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1)   Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.
(2)   Changes which must be made before publication

1. Authors must explain with what subject questions 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and possible questions after question 8 are related. If these questions are related to other issues and not with successors' training, than authors should explain the main focus of the research, and why and how they have split only questions 3 and 8 for actual research. This can be done in introduction part of the research and don't damage the quality of the article, in contrary.
2. At abstract, a short description about methodology and methods used, before starting explaining Pearson's correlation is needed.
3. Table should be reviewed in a time listing way from 1998 to 2014, (raw not columns) and probably is they can find any other important author of 2017 - 2019 to include as a fourth raw (not column).

1	1998...
2	2008...
3	2014...
4	2019...

4.   Include questionnaire as appendixes (Must).

Literature used is not the best of the issue. Comparisons with other countries situation improve the quality of the research, while is not required as must.

I suggest:
1. **Successful Habits of Family Business Successors 2004**
2. **Proactive Family Business Successors Kindle Edition by** Dean Fowler **2011**
3. **Family Business Succession Managing the All-Important Family Component KPMG ENTERPRISE 2011**
4. **Making Family Business Transfers successful through Education and Training The Key to Successful Succession Planning for Family Businesses 2017,** Will Tabor **and** James Vardaman
5. Family businesses successors' knowledge and willingness on sustainable innovation: The moderating role of leader's approval Yun-Zhong Wang, Fang-Yi Lo, Shan-Ming Weng. 2019

6. Etc.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: