UNIVERSITAS
LAMBUNG MANGKURAT

rajiani ULM <rajiani@ulm.ac.id>

[fso] Submission Acknowledgement

1 message

ojs@wsb.edu.pl <ojs@wsb.edu.pl> Sat, Nov 7, 2020 at 3:55 PM
Reply-To: Włodzimierz Sroka <wsroka@wsb.edu.pl>
To: Ismi Rajiani <rajiani@ulm.ac.id>

Ismi Rajiani,

Thank you for submitting the manuscript, "From Innovation to Market: Integrating University and Industry Perspectives towards Commercializing Research Output " to Forum Scientiae Oeconomia. With the online journal management system that we are using, you will be able to track its progress through the editorial process by logging in to the journal web site:

Submission URL: http://ojs.wsb.edu.pl/index.php/fso/authorDashboard/submission/321
Username: ismi1966

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering this journal as a venue for your work.

Włodzimierz Sroka

Forum Scientiae Oeconomia

[fso] Editor Decision

1 message

ojs@wsb.edu.pl <ojs@wsb.edu.pl> Sat, Nov 14, 2020 at 6:18 PM
Reply-To: "Włodzimierz Sroka, Editor in Chief" <WSroka@wsb.edu.pl>
To: Norain Ismail Ismail <norain@utem.edu.my>, Sebastian Kot <sebacat@zim.pcz.czest.pl>, Ahmad Shamsul Abdul Aziz <sham@uum.edu.my>, Ismi Rajiani <rajiani@ulm.ac.id>

Dear Authors,

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Forum Scientiae Oeconomia, "From Innovation to Market: Integrating University and Industry Perspectives towards Commercializing Research Output ".

Our decision is: Minor Revisions Required

Please then follow the recommendations of the reviewers presented below and send us a revised manuscript.

When doing so, please used the guidelines for authors stipulated at the journal's web page.

Best regards
Włodzimierz Sroka,

Editor in Chief
WSroka@wsb.edu.pl

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

A. Meeting the evaluation criteria
(Please put a number from 1 to 5 into box for each criterion to evaluate the paper, where 1 = very poor, 2 = poor, 3 = average, 4 = good and 5 = excellent)

1. Does the title of the paper correspond to its content ?

5 excellent

2. Is the topic presented in the paper relevant, timely and of a significant importance for science?

5 excellent

3. Is the paper an original study?

4 good

4. Is the research methodology appropriate and applied properly ?

4 good

5. Is the goal of the paper clearly specified and realized?

4 good

6. Is the paper clearly and concisely written and well organized ?

4 good

7. Does the manuscript contain sufficient and appropriate references ?

4 good

8. Are tables and figures appropriate and adequate ?

5 excellent

9. Does the abstract of the paper satisfactorily present the goals, methods and results?

4 good

10. Do the conclusions clearly summarize the main results and contributions of the paper ?

4 good

11. Is the language of the paper correct?

4 good

45-55 points Accept
35-44 points Accept with minor revisions
26-34 points The text requires major revision and new external review
<25 points Reject

B. Final recommendation (please put a sign X on the line next to your decision)

Accept with minor revisions (35-44 points)

C. Justification for disposition

1. Additional comments or suggestions to be sent to the author (s)

1- The manuscript needs Proof-reading.
2- Abstract needs revision on research method and conclusion part.
3- Introduction needs more explanation on the phenomenon of Commercializing Research Output. It doesn't highlight Innovation in University whereas it integrates industry resulting in Commercialization. It should be reworded accordingly.

4- Literature Review needs a part on the Commercializing process in industry as well as how Innovation in University fits to the industry.

5- References and citations need double checking as Zhao, G.J. (2013) is not in the text.

6- Sample selection approach is vague and needs more clarification.

7- The process of finding the strength and weaknesses of collaboration between industry and university on the Research Output of Universities which analyzed by Thematic approach should be combined with discussion in section 4 of manuscript, including 4.1until 4.3.

8- Rewrite the conclusion as it should be substantiated by recent studies.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

A. Meeting the evaluation criteria
(Please put a number from 1 to 5 into box for each criterion to evaluate the paper, where 1 = very poor, 2 = poor, 3 = average, 4 = good and 5 = excellent)

1. Does the title of the paper correspond to its content ?

4 good

2. Is the topic presented in the paper relevant, timely and of a significant importance for science?

4 good

3. Is the paper an original study?

4 good

4. Is the research methodology appropriate and applied properly ?

4 good

5. Is the goal of the paper clearly specified and realized?

4 good

6. Is the paper clearly and concisely written and well organized ?

4 good

7. Does the manuscript contain sufficient and appropriate references ?

5 excellent

8. Are tables and figures appropriate and adequate ?

4 good

9. Does the abstract of the paper satisfactorily present the goals, methods and results?

5 excellent

10. Do the conclusions clearly summarize the main results and contributions of the paper ?

5 excellent

11. Is the language of the paper correct?

4 good

45-55 points Accept
35-44 points Accept with minor revisions
26-34 points The text requires major revision and new external review
<25 points Reject

B. Final recommendation (please put a sign X on the line next to your decision)

Accept (45-55 points)

C. Justification for disposition

1. Additional comments or suggestions to be sent to the author (s)

Please add some references from FSO to increase the SJR.
