

Paper: **“Industrial Growth and Socio-Economic Impact: An Analysis of Armi's Manufacturing History in the Mongiana Industrial Village of Serre Calabria”**

Submitted: 03 January 2024

Accepted: 27 February 2024

Published: 29 February 2024

Corresponding Author: Elia Fiorenza

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n5p107

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Antonio Macchione
Università della Calabria, Italy

Reviewer 2: Szűcs Róbert Sándor
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: 26 gennaio 2024	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Industrial growth and socio-economic impact: An analysis of Armi's manufacturing history in the Mongiana industrial village of Serre Calabria	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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 of the contribution summarizes its content well. However, the following modification is suggested to bring the story of the Mongiana industrial complex into full light:</i>	

<i>«Armi's manufacturing in the Mongiana Village (Serre di Calabria) between industrial growth and socio-economic impact»</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract is more than sufficiently clear regarding the objectives of the research and the results achieved, but lacks the methodological approach that is recommended to be integrated.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Nothing to report except the repetition of the word 'also' on page 6 line 7.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The method used is very clear and there are no particular findings to make. This is an innovative study for a research sector that has so far only been the subject of microhistorical reflection.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>There is a perfect coincidence between the research expectations and the expected results. In my opinion, however, it is necessary to dedicate some more historical and historical-economic notation (in a diachronic sense) to the territorial context in which Mongiana is inserted.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Conclusions and summary are very accurate and effectively support the content of the essay.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are appropriate and functional to the reasoning made. However, the primary use of first-hand sources is suggested.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The beautiful contribution provides an interesting and unprecedented insight into regional history. The reference bibliography is excellent. However, it is advisable to give greater priority to the use of primary sources (archive documents and manuscripts) to support historiographical interpretation.

It is also advisable to begin with a brief historiographical examination of the topic discussed and reserve space for in-depth analysis of the historical and historical economic context in which the Mongiana experience takes place.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
Nothing

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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. Róbert Sándor Szűcs	
University/Country: University of Debrecen, Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 19.02.2024.	Date Review Report Submitted: 23.02.2024
Manuscript Title: Industrial growth and socio-economic impact: An analysis of Armi's manufacturing history in the Mongiana industrial village of Serre Calabria	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 31.01.2024	
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.	5
The title provides a clear indication of the content, mentioning the specific focus on industrial growth and socio-economic impact in the Mongiana industrial village of Serre Calabria.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
The abstract provides a concise summary of the paper's objectives, methods, and key findings. It gives a clear overview of the research.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
Based on the provided text, the paper demonstrates a good level of language proficiency with minimal grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. However, a thorough proofreading and editing process could further improve the overall quality of the language and eliminate any remaining errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The paper clearly describes the methodology used.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The paper presents clear results, indicating the industrial growth and socio-economic impact in the Mongiana industrial village of Serre Calabria.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions accurately summarize the findings of the study. The conclusions are supported by the information presented throughout the paper.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The paper includes a list of references, providing sources that are relevant to the topic.	

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: