

PEER REVIEW REPORTS

CONTENTS

Sustentabilidade e inovação na indústria pet: Uma análise sob a perspectiva da Teoria da Modernização Ecológica.

Provensi, T., Marcon, M. L., Schmidt, J. L., Rodrigues, C. O., Sehnem, S. (2024). Sustentabilidade e inovação na indústria pet: Uma análise sob a perspectiva da Teoria da Modernização Ecológica. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 64(3), e2023-0247. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240301>

To read the peer review report, click [here](#)

The economic benefits of business mediation in the Brazilian scenario.

Carneiro, C., D., Duzert, Y., Almeida, R. A. (2024). The economic benefits of business mediation in the Brazilian scenario. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 64(3), e2023-0132. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240304>

To read the peer review report, click [here](#)

PEER REVIEW REPORT

Peer review report for:

Provensi, T., Marcon, M. L., Schmidt, J. L., Rodrigues, C. O., Sehnem, S. (2024). Sustentabilidade e inovação na indústria pet: Uma análise sob a perspectiva da Teoria da Modernização Ecológica. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 64(3), e2023-0247. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240301>

Disclaimer: The content of the Peer Review Report is the full copy of reviewers and authors' reports. Typing and punctuation errors are not edited.

Reviewer: Luciel Henrique de Oliveira , Faculdades de Campinas, Campinas, SP, Brasil. The second reviewer did not authorize disclosure of their identity and peer review report.

ROUND 1

Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer: Luciel Henrique de Oliveira

Date review returned: 13-Sep-2023

Recomendation: Major Revision

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).

Nenhum

Comments to the Author

The article presents a valuable analysis on the integration of sustainability and innovation in startups in the pet sector. Its strengths include topic relevance, organized structure, and theoretical contribution. However, there are opportunities for improvement in relation to quantitative data, sample representativeness, comparative discussion, discussion of limitations, expansion of the theoretical framework and practical suggestions. With these improvements, the article can become even more solid and informative.

Note to authors

Strong points:

- Clear Structure: The article has a well-organized structure, with distinct sections and a logical progression of ideas, making reading fluent.*
- Relevance of the Topic: The research addresses a relevant and contemporary topic, which is the integration of sustainability and innovation in startups in the pet sector. This may attract the attention of readers interested in sustainable entrepreneurship.*
- Extensive Data Analysis: The study includes several quotes and examples of interviews with professionals from different startups, which enriches the analysis and gives a comprehensive view of the sector.*

4. *Theoretical Contribution: The article contributes to the literature by exploring the application of Ecological Modernization Theory (TME) in startups and highlighting how these companies can contribute to ecological modernization.*

Improvement Opportunities:

1. *Quantitative Data: The article is mainly based on qualitative data, such as interviews. Including some quantitative data, such as statistics or startup performance metrics, can strengthen the analysis.*
2. *Most Representative Sample: The study mentions that only one professional from each startup was interviewed. For a more robust analysis, considering interviewing multiple professionals at each startup or increasing the sample of startups would be beneficial.*
3. *Comparative Discussion: The research could benefit from a more comparative discussion, perhaps contrasting startups that are adopting sustainable practices in a more advanced way with those that are just beginning to do so.*
4. *Discussion of Limitations: Further emphasizing the limitations of the study, such as sample size, subjectivity of respondents, and issues of bias, would be important to ensure the transparency and credibility of the research.*
5. *Expansion of the Theoretical Framework: Although the Ecological Modernization Theory is the main theoretical framework, considering the inclusion of other theories related to sustainability and innovation can enrich the analysis.*
6. *Practical Suggestions for Entrepreneurs: At the end of the article, including some practical suggestions or guidelines for entrepreneurs who want to integrate sustainability and innovation in startups would be helpful.*
7. *Language and Writing Review: Although the text is generally clear, a more detailed review can help eliminate minor grammatical errors and improve the fluidity of the writing.*
8. *Make the contributions of the research clearer: to theory and to the sector studied.*
9. *These are suggestions that can help improve the article. If it is not possible to cover them all, it is worth trying to consider which topics could be addressed to make the analyzes and contributions of the work more robust.*

Reviewer 2 Report

The reviewer did not authorize the disclosure of the peer review report.

ROUND 2

Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer: Luciel Henrique de Oliveira

Date review returned: 13-Nov-2023

Recomendation: Accept

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).

Nenhum

Comments to the Author

Caros Autores,

Gostaria de parabenizá-los pelo trabalho realizado no artigo sobre a análise da sustentabilidade e inovação em startups da indústria pet sob a Teoria da Modernização Ecológica. Vocês não apenas atenderam às expectativas, mas também foram além, fornecendo uma análise mais aprofundada, com redação clara e articulada. Com base na qualidade do estudo e nas melhorias realizadas, estou seguro em indicar o artigo para publicação. Seu trabalho é uma valiosa contribuição para o campo, oferecendo uma visão esclarecedora sobre a aplicação da teoria na realidade das startups pet e fornecendo sugestões práticas para uma gestão mais sustentável. Mais uma vez, parabéns pelo excelente trabalho!

PEER REVIEW REPORT

Peer review report for:

Carneiro, C., D., Duzert, Y., Almeida, R. A. (2024). The economic benefits of business mediation in the Brazilian scenario. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 64(3), e2023-0132. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020240304>

Disclaimer: The content of the Peer Review Report is the full copy of reviewers and authors' reports. Typing and punctuation errors are not edited.

Reviewer: Nathalia Mazzonetto [<http://lattes.cnpq.br/4098474154470874>], Müller Mazzonetto Sociedade de Advogados, São Paulo, SP, Brasil. The second reviewer did not authorize disclosure of their identity and peer review report.

ROUND 1

Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer: Nathalia Mazzonetto

Date review returned: 28-May-2023

Recomendation: Minor Revision

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).

Nenhum

Comments to the Author

Though article focuses on a quantitative methodology, it is worth referring to some quality aspects such as: why compare a consent mean with an adversarial one? I think author should consider also consulting local (Brazilian) references, as it is not always that international references apply to our reality as regards mediation. Note that the concept of multidoors system was not established in CNJ Resolution, it was converted herethere as a policy, but before Brazilian mediation practitioners have already incorporated it. Look for “errors” in the text, for instance pages 5 and 8. CIESP and FIESP less cost? Justify and refer to, I am not sure. Software R? Clarification is needed. Why not a concept of mediation provided by a local (Brazilian) doctrine once this is a paper on Brazilian mediation practice?

Reviewer 2 Report

The reviewer did not authorize the disclosure of the peer review report.

ROUND 2

Reviewer 1 Report

Reviewer: Nathalia Mazzonetto

Date review returned: 23-Oct-2023

Recomendation: Accept

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).

Nenhum

Comments to the Author

Consider for next time other references for a more inclusive and technical methodology. I would not recommend, either, referring mediation or any other consent mean as an alternative or exit from the Courts. The idea is to combine and integrate “multidoors” and mediation is not at service of Courts’ exceeding numbers.

Reviewer 2 Report

The reviewer did not authorize the disclosure of the peer review report.