



Peer Review Report


PEER REVIEW REPORT FOR:

Cavalcante, P., & Lotta, G. S. (2021). Boundary-crossing strategies: Managing macro policies in a federal government. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 25(5), e200012. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2021200012.en>

HOW TO CITE THIS PEER REVIEW REPORT:

Cavalcante, P., Lotta, G. S., & Vasconcellos, S. L. (2021). Peer review report for: Boundary-crossing strategies: Managing macro policies in a federal government. RAC. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*. *Zenodo*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4560406>

REVIEWERS:

 Silvio Luís de Vasconcellos (Escola Superior de Propaganda e Marketing, PPGA, Brazil)

ROUND 1

Reviewer 1 report

Reviewer 1 for this round chose not to disclose his/her review report.

Reviewer 2 report

Reviewer: Silvio Luís de Vasconcellos
Date review returned: May 22, 2020
Recommendation: Major revision

Comments to the authors

The paper Crossing Boundaries Strategies: managing macro policies in a Federal Government lays on the objective of analyzing

crossing boundaries strategies (CBS) in public administration.

The theme is relevant for the journal despite less contributive theoretically. Using three programs of the Brazilian Government along the time, the author applies the crossing boundaries strategies (CBS) to analyze them. Despite the author has analyzed the cases properly, there are no theoretical contributions, for example, a connection to an additional theory. I strongly recommend a connection to the Theory of Polycentrism (Batjargal et al., 2013) to compare the case, the context, and the dominant forces that characterized such institutional polycentric events.

Some structural aspects in the paper are far from the usual template in RAC's papers.

- . First, there are some tables in the introductory section.
- . Second, there is no method section.
- . Third, as methodological procedures are in the introductory section, then the introductory section is excessively long and do not capture the attention of the reader.
- . Forth, the sections are titled with questions.

The literature is out-of-date. The most recent citation is just one paper of 2017. There is no citation of published works in the last three years.

REFERENCES SUGGESTED

Batjargal, B., Hitt, M. A., Tsui, A. S., Arregle, J.-L., Webb, J. W., & Miller, T. L. (2013). Institutional Polycentrism, Entrepreneurs' Social Networks, and New Venture Growth. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(4), 1024–1049. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0095>

Additional Questions:

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?: No

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?: Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?: Yes

Are the methods described comprehensively?: Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?: Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?: Yes

Is the language acceptable?: Yes

Does the article have data and / or materials that could be made publicly available by the authors?: Yes

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).: NONE

Rating:

Interest: 2. Good

Quality: 2. Good

Originality: 4. Below Average

Overall: 3. Average

Authors' Responses

Dear Editor,

Please find attached the paper's new version. Indeed, the suggestions helped to qualify the study. We included almost all of them, as detailed in the main document and in the letters. In short, the revision has several changes in the paper's introduction, theoretical discussion with new articles (updated to 2020), empirical sections, and final remarks.

Sincerely,

[The authors' responses to the comments of Reviewer 1 for this round were omitted from this report, since the reviewer did not authorize the disclosure of his/her report.]

Letter to the Reviewer 2

Dear Reviewer,

First, we would like to thank you for the paper's critical and detailed analysis. Indeed, the suggestions help to qualify the study. In this sense, we incorporated them, as detailed below. In short, the revision made several changes in the paper's introduction, theoretical discussion with new articles (updated to 2020), empirical sections, and final remarks.

1. Despite the author has analyzed the cases properly, there are no theoretical contributions, for example, a connection to an additional theory. I strongly recommend a connection to the Theory of Polycentrism (Batjargal et al., 2013) to compare the case, the context, and the dominant forces that characterized such institutional polycentric events.

R: We read the paper and incorporated their discussion into our paper. Thank you for the suggestion.

2. Some structural aspects in the paper are far from the usual template in RAC's papers.

- . First, there are some tables in the introductory section;
- . Second, there is no method section;
- . Third, as methodological procedures are in the introductory section, then the introductory section is excessively long and do not capture the attention of the reader.
- . Forth, the sections are titled with questions.

R: We changed the structure of the paper. In this way, we took of the table and the methodological procedures from the introduction, reducing it. We also changed the name of the sections excluding the questions.

3. The literature is out-of-date. The most recent citation is just one paper of 2017. There is no citation of published works in the last three years.

R: we did a more updated literature review including papers published between 2018-2020 in top international journals and we included them in the paper.

ROUND 2

Reviewer 1 report

Reviewer 1 for this round chose not to disclose his/her review report.

Authors' Responses

The authors' responses to the comments of Reviewer 1 for this round were omitted from this report, since the reviewer did not authorize the disclosure of his/her report.

Disclaimer: The content of the Peer Review Report is the full copy of reviewers and authors' reports. Typing and punctuation errors are not edited. Only comments that violate the journal's ethical policies such as derogatory or defamatory comments will be edited (omitted) from the report. In these cases, it will be clearly stated that parts of the report were edited. Check [RAC's policies](#).