

**Paper: “The Virtuous Circle of Intellectual Capital and Corporate Environmentalism: Evidence from the Food Industry”**

**Submitted: 16 October 2020**

**Accepted: 07 December 2020**

**Published: 31 January 2021**

Corresponding Author: Eugenio D'Angelo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n1p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n1p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Moses Odhiambo Aluoch  
University of Nairobi, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Blinded

# 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. Moses Odhiambo Aluoch, PhD	
University/Country: University of Nairobi, Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 20.10.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 21.10.2020
Manuscript Title: THE VIRTUOUS CIRCLE OF INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL AND CORPORATE ENVIRONMENTALISM: EVIDENCE FROM THE FOOD INDUSTRY	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1108/20	
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>	<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>4</b>
<i>Include the context of the study in the title. Where the study was carried out</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Include context of the study in the abstract. Make the following corrections:----- with 1,686 firm-year observations. Result confirms----- Include theoretical reviews in the abstract and research design.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Yes. In introduction last paragraph. --- this <b>work</b> provides an empirical investigation in a highly concerned industry for environmental issues, such <b>as the food</b>. Paraphrase the remaining part from: ---The reminder of this-----</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Theoretical reviews and empirical reviews not clear: Include theoretical literature and empirical literature reviews under the headings related to hypotheses: 1) the level of intellectual capital and level of environmental performance. 2) the level of environmental performance and intellectual property.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Very good analyses. Use Table1 and Table2 for table numbering. Correct grammatical errors.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Conclusions from the results are properly done</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Please rework on references and remove the ones not cited in the document, e.g references 51,52,55,56,57,58,59,60 are not in the document. 53 and 54 are repeated.</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------	--------------------------

Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
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.
  
- (2) Changes which must be made before publication

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**