

Paper: “Virtuous Legislation: The Royal Decree for the Sustainable Management of the Woods of Serra San Bruno, Stilo, Mongiana, and Ferdinanda”

Submitted: 22 April 2024

Accepted: 18 July 2024

Published: 31 July 2024

Corresponding Author: Elia Fiorenza

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n20p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n20p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Katerina Tosevska

Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, North Macedonia

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: Katerina Toshevska-Trpchevska	
University/Country: Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, Faculty of Economics – Skopje/ Macedonia	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/06/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/06/2024
Manuscript Title: Virtuous Legislation: The Royal Decree for the Sustainable Management of the Woods of Serra San Bruno, Stilo, Mongiana, and Ferdinanda.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0515/24	
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
<i>No comments.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>The abstract could be written to clearly identify the object, method and results of the paper.</i>	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The language is clear and understandable.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>It is an economic history paper and only explication (narrative method) is used.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Since it is a historical paper, there aren't many results presented.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>There is no conclusion in the paper.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>In certain places the references are too extensive.</i>	

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):

My biggest concern is the longitude of the paper. The paper is 28 pages and together with references 35 pages. I think that this is too long for a research article, it might be this long if a monograph is published. But in this case, I suggest shortening the paper to at least 20 pages. For example, in the second part of the paper there is also repetition of the pre-last paragraph with the last paragraph. I suggest in this part the authors shorten the explication of the law for sustainability of the trees. In the third part, also I suggest shortening the explication of the cost calculation and shortening of the quotations on pp.23-24 and on p.25. The authors could shorten the third section by critically addressing the calculation of the costs for transport of trees.

The key words provided are not completely appropriate. The authors could use other key words that better explain the article.

There is no introduction and what is more worrying and missing for me is the absence of a conclusion. In the last paragraphs of the third part the authors have written certain aspects that point to concluding remarks, but I would suggest a little elaboration and trying to find the connection between the old Law for sustainability in Calabria with the economic situation today. Because sustainability is of great importance for each economy, and I see the importance of this paper in this sense.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: