

Paper: “Urban and Social Regeneration in Abruzzo: An Open Problem and a Possible Way Forward”

Submitted: 10 January 2022

Accepted: 30 March 2022

Published: 30 April 2022

Corresponding Author: Roberto Veraldi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n12p15](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n12p15)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Stefania Capogna
Link Campus University, Italy

Reviewer 2: Jorge Tenório Fernando
Centro Estadual de Educação Tecnológica Paula Souza (FATEC), Brazil

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: STEFANIA CAPOGNA	
University/Country: LINK CAMPUS UNIVERSITY	
Date Manuscript Received: 14.02.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 22.02.2022
Manuscript Title: URBAN AND SOCIAL REGENERATION IN ABRUZZO: A POSSIBLE WAY FORWARD AND AN OPEN PROBLEM	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comment Yup</i> YES There are some typos and minor errors, a native speaker proof reading is suggested	
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> The discussion is very clear. It would be useful to briefly clarify: - the use of secondary data and on which basis the sources were chosen - the source for images 6-7-9	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>(Please insert your comments there are no conclusions,</i> There are no conclusions. It is suggested to briefly report the most salient results / considerations of the interesting work carried out	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> ok	

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The essay is very interesting and well written. There are only two minimal suggestions for the author: -- do a proof reading by a native speaker to make sure there are no mistakes;

- insert a brief conclusion that can enhance the most important results of the analysis carried out.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Jorge Tenório Fernando	
University/Country: Centro Estadual de Educação Tecnológica Paula Souza (FATEC), Brazil	
Date Manuscript Received: 28.02.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 08.03.2022
Manuscript Title: URBAN AND SOCIAL REGENERATION IN ABRUZZO: A POSSIBLE WAY FORWARD AND AN OPEN PROBLEM	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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]
------------------	--

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<p>YES. However, I guess that from a logical perspective usually we would first discuss the problem, then point to some solution – so, allow me to recommend inverting the title as follows: <i>URBAN AND SOCIAL REGENERATION IN ABRUZZO: AN OPEN PROBLEM AND A POSSIBLE WAY FORWARD.</i></p>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<p>NO. The abstract looks more like the introduction section than a summary of the research piece. Considering the abstract is normally the part that stands out in online searching mechanisms, and being the part that people usually read in the first place, I strongly recommend reformulating, so that your abstract responds adequately to the following questions:</p> <p>1 – WHAT? Indicate clearly what the objective of the paper is – your research problem.</p> <p>2 – WHY? Justify your study, i.e. say why it is important to discuss the problem you chose.</p> <p>3 – HOW? Explain how you are going to tackle the problem – your research methodology.</p> <p>4 – SO WHAT? Indicate your findings, i.e., the results you achieved with your study.</p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<p>YES. No major problems were spot in the paper. Some proofreading may be beneficial to avoid repetitions, for instance “on the other hand” used twice in 4 lines (p. 10). But overall, the paper is well written.</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<p>NO. The paper is a basically descriptive/informative report, i.e. it does not bring a theoretical background that could be beneficial for other researchers to apply, nor does it present a methodology that other researchers could follow to discuss similar phenomena as it is expected of a scholarly article. To adjust and boost your paper, I suggest you might make use of the standards for academic studies. One of the most popular is the IMRAD. In terms of method, perhaps you could adopt a CASE STUDY to analyze Abruzzo?</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<p>NO. There are no results section or a presentation of results accordingly. Instead, the paper brings three sections: 1. The Abruzzo economic model; 2. The relationship between territory and economic growth; 3. The problem of socio-urban regeneration in Abruzzo. These sections mix theory and application of theory altogether, which makes difficult for other researchers to use this paper as a contribution to his or her own research. My recommendation is getting those in separate sections, for instance: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND (= foundations); and RESULTS (= application of theory to analyze the Abruzzo case)</p>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>NO. There are no conclusions indicated. I suppose you need to point out at least to what extent you believe you have reached the objectives set at the beginning of your paper. Besides, if you wish, you could also indicate a. some limitations of the study; b. some suggestions for further research.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>YES. The references are very adequate, but they are spread all over the paper. Ideally, most of them should be in a section called Theoretical Background (or Literature Review) so we know what relations were made between the concepts raised i.e. are they complementary? Are they opposed?</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear Colleague(s),

Your manuscript brings an interesting and relevant topic for discussion, that of urban and social regeneration in a specific region in Italy.

My understanding is that you built an informative/descriptive paper. That is all right, as long as the structure allows for other researchers to quickly identify your thought process and follow your path so as to add value to similar pieces of research they may have.

Therefore, some suggestions to make it more robust and attractive to be published would be to reframe the structure to make it more in the shape of an academic paper – that will facilitate reading and the possible use of concepts by other authors. To do that, perhaps you may use the IMRAD structure, available at: <https://www.editage.com/assets/files/english/guidelinks/imrad-checklist.pdf>. Other comments and remarks were made in the specific fields above.

I hope to have contributed to your paper and wish good luck with your publishing efforts.

With academic regards,

Your Reviewer

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: