



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_46594
Title of the Manuscript:	Interactive learning and innovation: conceptual and mathematical models. A study of the Venetian district
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The paper focuses on several dimensional elements that drive innovation and learning. One that seems to be conspicuously missing - especially given the focus of this journal - is economic proximity. Many economic aspects are implied, and I believe the paper would be improved by fleshing out some of the details. First, it is implied that economic proximity for the current problem is still in the range of specialization, which essentially means that there are potential economic complementarities between inputs into the production function that could drive down costs and increase competitiveness - this ties closely with "proximity." This is never explored fully, even though the technical term "substitution effect" is used repeatedly in the document. That term must be defined clearly, in the context of interactions between inputs. The economic substitution effect is easily misunderstood, and I would be interested in the authors' specific clarification.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>* "Low/High" proximity should be replaced with "Far/Close" proximity. The first terms can be confusing. * Provide more detail about the dimensions of proximity, especially economics if it is added. In many cases the discussion of "proximity" makes perfect sense (especially when invoking vertical and horizontal aspects), but in others, it could mean a great many things. I would assume that this is clarified in the math, but more transparency would be desirable with more verbage.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>A highly-rigorous conceptual model is presented, with a very careful layout of the individual mathematical components. The authors do a very good job of linking this to the support of their proposals. I will not pretend to understand at a deep level every aspect of this model. However, the model is highly generalized, and the degree to which is ties in to the glassmaking industry in the Venetian district is a bit murky. I will not ask the authors to conduct an empirical validation of the model, with data gathering and model estimation. That would not be the strength of the paper. On the other hand, the paper would benefit from a discussion of exactly how the model could be used to reach real-life conclusions about this industry. As it stands, the model seems like it could be applied in many different contexts, and the link to the Venetian glassmakers needs to be more cogent. Calling the Murano Industrial District an "empirical" application seems like a stretch given the lack of study details. What does this industry explicitly have to gain from the study?</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>William S. Breffle</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Michigan Technological University, USA</i>