

## PEER REVIEW REPORT OF THE MANUSCRIPT



### Manuscript data:

Type of manuscript : Discussion (Pensata)

Title : The role of business school professors in addressing today's ethical crisis in business

Authors : Ronald Jean Degen  

Artigo ID: e2712

Manuscript's DOI : <https://doi.org/10.14211/regepe.esbj.e2712>

### Peer review report data:

How to cite : Vico, A., & Machado, H. P. V. (2026). Peer review report of the manuscript: The role of business school professors in addressing today's ethical crisis in business. *REGEPE Entrepreneurship and Small Business Journal*, 15, e2712. <https://doi.org/10.14211/regepe.esbj.e2712pr>



Round ↓	Reviewers			
	1	2	3	4
1	R1R1	R1R2		
2	R2R1	R2R2		
3				
4				

### Editorial data:

Editor-in-Chief<sup>1</sup> or Adjunct<sup>2</sup>:   
<sup>1</sup> Dr. Edmundo Inácio Júnior  
Univ. Estadual de Campinas, UNICAMP

Editor Associado Responsável:   
Dra. Rose Mary Almeida Lopes  
ANEGEPE

Executive<sup>1</sup> or Assistant<sup>2</sup> Editor:  
<sup>1</sup>M. Eng. Patrícia Trindade de Araújo

## ROUND 1:

### 1<sup>st</sup> Reviewer: Antonio Vico

Completed : 2025-08-02 10:10 AM  
Recommendation : Accept Submission

#### 1. Writing

The writing is clear, objective, and concise. The separation of the text into sections and subsections is pertinent and facilitates the reading process.

Strongly Disagree: Text with many grammar and spelling errors, confusing and difficult to follow.

Disagree: Text with some grammar and spelling errors, somewhat unclear writing.

Neutral: Text with few grammar and spelling errors, generally clear writing.

Agree: Well-written text with minimal errors, clear and coherent writing.

- Strongly Agree: Impeccable text, no grammar or spelling errors, very clear and fluid writing.

#### 2. Argumentation

The author(s)' argument is clear and cohesive, described in a robust manner and using clear and plausible connections between constructs, concepts and ideas.

Totally disagree: The argumentation is inadequate, with few connections between constructs and ideas.

Disagree: The argumentation is superficial or weak, with limited connections and lack of support.

Neutral: The argumentation is adequate, but could be more in-depth.

- Agree: The argument is cohesive and well-structured.

Totally agree: The argument is coherent and critical, with pertinent ideas and insights.

#### 3. Theoretical background

The bibliography employed by the author(s) is extensive, comprehensive, and seamlessly integrated into the discussion in the manuscript. A balance is established between classic and contemporary references, with a clear and substantial connection between them.

Strongly Disagree: Inadequate literature review, few relevant references.

Disagree: Superficial literature review, limited references.

Neutral: Adequate literature review but could be more in-depth.

- Agree: Comprehensive and well-structured literature review.

Strongly Agree: Very comprehensive and critical literature review with extremely relevant references.

#### 4. Counterpoint

The theoretical essay synthesizes, identifies, and then contrasts the prevailing theoretical framework in the field. It proposes theoretical or paradigmatic changes, establishes new or pioneering ideas, and offers a comprehensive analysis of the theoretical landscape.

Totally disagree: The discussion is inadequate, the theoretical approaches are not fully addressed, and there is no theoretical progress.

Disagree: The discussion was superficial, and there was minimal theoretical progress.

Neutral: The discussion was satisfactory, but could be more clearly and precisely articulated.

Agree: The discussion was clear and the theoretical advance was relevant.

- Totally agree: The text offers a clear and critical discussion, with evident theoretical advancement relevant to the field of study.

## 5. Further Studies

The theoretical essay contributes to the field of research by providing insights that can be applied by researchers in future research based on the reported discussion.

Totally disagree: Absence of insights and lack of direction for future research.

Disagree: The insights provided are superficial and lack specificity and direction.

Neutral: The insights are relevant, but could be more effectively directed towards advancing the field of research.

Agree: The insights are relevant and the direction is clear.

- Totally agree: The insights are relevant, specific, and plausible, and they offer potential avenues for future research that could advance the field of study.

## 6. General Evaluation

Please provide a **qualitative assessment** of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be **as clear and specific as possible**. This space is also intended for **general comments** that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

Retomada de princípios com ênfase na sua atualização. Pesquisa ampla a respeito do tema abordado. Entendo que, a opção de encaminhar o estudo para p "pós-graduação" é válida, porém, entendo que pode ser ampliada para graduação e todos os cursos anteriores à graduação. A ênfase nas últimas linhas do artigo considerando que os alunos tem o seu primeiro "treinamento", me parece fora da realidade brasileira, onde boa parte dos cursos são noturnos e os estudantes trabalham, alguns deles com idades e experiências mais avançadas. Em se tratando de estudantes de pós-graduação, eles não estão vivenciando, de maneira geral o seu primeiro treinamento. Destacando que é visão do autor, fruto de intensa pesquisa efetuada, permite reflexão e colabora para que novas pesquisas possam ser realizadas.

## 7. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

- Approved.

## 8. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

- Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.
- Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.
- I do NOT agree to open the review.

## 2nd Reviewer: Hilka Pelizza Vier Machado

Completed : 2025-07-30 03:46 PM  
Recommendation : Decline Submission

### 1. Writing

The writing is clear, objective, and concise. The separation of the text into sections and subsections is pertinent and facilitates the reading process.

Strongly Disagree: Text with many grammar and spelling errors, confusing and difficult to follow.

Disagree: Text with some grammar and spelling errors, somewhat unclear writing.

■ Neutral: Text with few grammar and spelling errors, generally clear writing.

Agree: Well-written text with minimal errors, clear and coherent writing.

Strongly Agree: Impeccable text, no grammar or spelling errors, very clear and fluid writing.

### 2. Argumentation

The author(s)' argument is clear and cohesive, described in a robust manner and using clear and plausible connections between constructs, concepts and ideas.

Totally disagree: The argumentation is inadequate, with few connections between constructs and ideas.

■ Disagree: The argumentation is superficial or weak, with limited connections and lack of support.

Neutral: The argumentation is adequate, but could be more in-depth.

Agree: The argument is cohesive and well-structured.

Totally agree: The argument is coherent and critical, with pertinent ideas and insights.

### 3. Theoretical background

The bibliography employed by the author(s) is extensive, comprehensive, and seamlessly integrated into the discussion in the manuscript. A balance is established between classic and contemporary references, with a clear and substantial connection between them.

Strongly Disagree: Inadequate literature review, few relevant references.

Disagree: Superficial literature review, limited references.

■ Neutral: Adequate literature review but could be more in-depth.

Agree: Comprehensive and well-structured literature review.

Strongly Agree: Very comprehensive and critical literature review with extremely relevant references.

### 4. Counterpoint

The theoretical essay synthesizes, identifies, and then contrasts the prevailing theoretical framework in the field. It proposes theoretical or paradigmatic changes, establishes new or pioneering ideas, and offers a comprehensive analysis of the theoretical landscape.

Totally disagree: The discussion is inadequate, the theoretical approaches are not fully addressed, and there is no theoretical progress.

■ Disagree: The discussion was superficial, and there was minimal theoretical progress.

Neutral: The discussion was satisfactory, but could be more clearly and precisely articulated.

Agree: The discussion was clear and the theoretical advance was relevant.

Totally agree: The text offers a clear and critical discussion, with evident theoretical advancement relevant to the field of study.

## 5. Further Studies

The theoretical essay contributes to the field of research by providing insights that can be applied by researchers in future research based on the reported discussion.

Totally disagree: Absence of insights and lack of direction for future research.

Disagree: The insights provided are superficial and lack specificity and direction.

Neutral: The insights are relevant, but could be more effectively directed towards advancing the field of research.

Agree: The insights are relevant and the direction is clear.

- Totally agree: The insights are relevant, specific, and plausible, and they offer potential avenues for future research that could advance the field of study.

## 6. General Evaluation

Please provide a **qualitative assessment** of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be **as clear and specific as possible**. This space is also intended for **general comments** that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

- 1- The manuscript is well written. However, it is not structured with the rigor of a scientific article. The text is very fragmented in several sections and subsections. In addition, the sections are very short, often only one or two paragraphs, which are not enough to support the idea or develop the topic. It is not usual to create a separation as presented at the end of each section of the article, in which the author separates: "conclusion of section 1" and the same for the following sections.
- 2- The text brings several arguments, many of them are not clear or are not based theoretically. Some statements/arguments are inserted in the text, but they have not been well developed theoretically. For example: "Business school professors .... must they educate students on ethical fundamentals, but they must also train them to discern between authentic responsibility and performative compliance". Similar form is presented at the end of topics 3.2, 3,4 and 4.1, among others.

The author's thinking about the role of teachers is not clear. Throughout the text, the author comments on some unethical organizational behaviors and assigns to teachers the role of dealing with these issues. It is true that Administration teachers face a number of unethical organizational practices, but would it be their role to deal with these issues? How would teachers be able to account for a structural reality? In my view, the text brings relevant points, but does not manage to deal with the discussion consistently.

On page 12, the author mentions that teachers should: Encourage interdisciplinary exposure, use storytelling, assign "futureback'...." among others, but it does not present the basis from which these recommendations were drawn. This is repeated in the text in general. There is a series of prescriptions for teachers, which the author launches in the text, without developing the thought or demonstrating how this could, in fact, contribute to face the inclusion of critical contemporary issues in the training of students. I stress that it is interesting the problem that the text raises, but the author can not deal theoretically with the points he presents.

- 3- The text brings a series of questions - for example - pandemic, hyperindividualism, ethical dilemmas, ESG, artificial intelligence - among others, some relevant bibliography is integrated into the discussion, balancing classical and contemporary references, but the thoughts are not articulated or expanded for greater depth in discussions.

The suggestions presented by the author seem more opinions of him than, in fact, theoretical arguments built and developed in the text.

- 4- The author did not offer a comprehensive analysis of the theoretical landscape.
- 5- No. The way the article was structured, there is not a coherent line of theoretical support that can serve for future research.
- 6- The text raises many important contemporary issues and attempts to connect them with the role of Administration professors. However, the theoretical framework of the discussion lacks necessary boundaries. Instead of developing a cohesive argument, the text offers a series of fragmented points that detract from clarity. Furthermore, the author provides recommendations without theoretical support.

For future versions of the manuscript, I recommend that the author first establish a solid theoretical foundation regarding the actions and responsibilities of professors. Once that framework is in place, they should selectively address a few key aspects—instead of attempting to cover everything in one article—and explore each in depth. This approach would generate greater focus, stronger theoretical grounding, and more coherent development of the argument.

**7. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):**

Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

- Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Approved.

**8. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:**

- Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.
- Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.
- I do NOT agree to open the review.

## ROUND 2:

### 1<sup>st</sup> Reviewer: Antonio Vico

Completed : 2025-11-12 10:34 AM  
Recommendation : Accept Submission

#### 1. Writing

The writing is clear, objective, and concise. The separation of the text into sections and subsections is pertinent and facilitates the reading process.

Strongly Disagree: Text with many grammar and spelling errors, confusing and difficult to follow.

Disagree: Text with some grammar and spelling errors, somewhat unclear writing.

Neutral: Text with few grammar and spelling errors, generally clear writing.

Agree: Well-written text with minimal errors, clear and coherent writing.

- Strongly Agree: Impeccable text, no grammar or spelling errors, very clear and fluid writing.

#### 2. Timeliness

The manuscript presents a convincing argument for the assertion that the chosen topic is one that is both novel and cutting-edge.

Totally disagree: The argumentation is not convincing and the chosen topic cannot be considered a cutting edge topic.

Disagree: The argument is not well developed and the topic is of limited relevance.

Neutral: Clear argument, but could be more emphatic about the timeliness of the subject.

- Agree: Clear argument and current and significant topic.

Totally agree: Strong and coherent argument that clearly demonstrates the timeliness of the topic.

#### 3. Reasoning

The bibliography employed by the author(s) is extensive, comprehensive, and seamlessly integrated into the discussion in the manuscript. A balance is established between classic and contemporary references, with a clear and substantial connection between them.

Strongly disagree: Empirical rationale is not clear or up-to-date.

Disagree: Weak, outdated justifications.

Neutral: Clear rationales, but could be more up-to-date.

- Agree: Clear rationale and up-to-date positioning.

Strongly agree: Clear and coherent rationale that comprehensively presents the key empirical aspects of the issue.

#### 4. Provocation

The manuscript is able to make the reader think about the problem situation in question.

Strongly disagree: The argument fails to engage the reader in thinking about the discussion.

Disagree: Unconvincing articulation, little meaningful reflection.

Neutral: Persuasive articulation, but could lead to more robust and meaningful reflection.

Agree: Compelling articulation and interesting reflections.

- Strongly agree: The articulation is convincing and allows for considerable and rich reflection on the discussion.

#### 5. Applicability

The discussions in the manuscript are useful for generating new ideas and insights that can lead to practical developments and academic research.

Strongly disagree: The discussion is inadequate, and no new ideas or practical progress are evident.

Disagree: The discussion is superficial, and there is little prospect of practical or theoretical progress.

Neutral: The discussion offers potential advances, but they could be more robust or significant.

- Agree: The discussion outlines the possibility of practical and theoretical advances.

Strongly agree: The discussion is clear and coherent, and it presents a cohesive position on the ways of advancing the topic in practical terms and through new research initiatives.

## 6. General Evaluation

Please provide a **qualitative assessment** of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be **as clear and specific as possible**. This space is also intended for **general comments** that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

O texto é opinativo sobre o tema. Seu objetivo é a partir de pesquisa efetuada, analisar e comentar a respeito do tema. Possui características básicas de registrar os pensamentos e reflexões do(a) responsável pela autoria do texto. Carrega tom opinativo expressando a visão e a reflexão do seu responsável e tem um caráter crítico o que promove o pensar e discutir sobre o tema em estudo, portanto apresenta um pensamento, talvez uma ideia. De minha parte está aprovado.

## 7. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

- Approved.

## 8. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

- Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.
- Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.
- I do NOT agree to open the review.

## 2nd Reviewer: Hilka Pelizza Vier Machado

Completed : 2025-10-20 01:27 PM  
Recommendation : Accept Submission

### 1. Writing

The writing is clear, objective, and concise. The separation of the text into sections and subsections is pertinent and facilitates the reading process.

Strongly Disagree: Text with many grammar and spelling errors, confusing and difficult to follow.

Disagree: Text with some grammar and spelling errors, somewhat unclear writing.

Neutral: Text with few grammar and spelling errors, generally clear writing.

■ Agree: Well-written text with minimal errors, clear and coherent writing.

Strongly Agree: Impeccable text, no grammar or spelling errors, very clear and fluid writing.

### 2. Timeliness

The manuscript presents a convincing argument for the assertion that the chosen topic is one that is both novel and cutting-edge.

Totally disagree: The argumentation is not convincing and the chosen topic cannot be considered a cutting edge topic.

Disagree: The argument is not well developed and the topic is of limited relevance.

Neutral: Clear argument, but could be more emphatic about the timeliness of the subject.

■ Agree: Clear argument and current and significant topic.

Totally agree: Strong and coherent argument that clearly demonstrates the timeliness of the topic.

### 3. Reasoning

The bibliography employed by the author(s) is extensive, comprehensive, and seamlessly integrated into the discussion in the manuscript. A balance is established between classic and contemporary references, with a clear and substantial connection between them.

Strongly disagree: Empirical rationale is not clear or up-to-date.

Disagree: Weak, outdated justifications.

Neutral: Clear rationales, but could be more up-to-date.

■ Agree: Clear rationale and up-to-date positioning.

Strongly agree: Clear and coherent rationale that comprehensively presents the key empirical aspects of the issue.

### 4. Provocation

The manuscript is able to make the reader think about the problem situation in question.

Strongly disagree: The argument fails to engage the reader in thinking about the discussion.

Disagree: Unconvincing articulation, little meaningful reflection.

Neutral: Persuasive articulation, but could lead to more robust and meaningful reflection.

■ Agree: Compelling articulation and interesting reflections.

Strongly agree: The articulation is convincing and allows for considerable and rich reflection on the discussion.

### 5. Applicability

The discussions in the manuscript are useful for generating new ideas and insights that can lead to practical developments and academic research.

Strongly disagree: The discussion is inadequate, and no new ideas or practical progress are evident.

Disagree: The discussion is superficial, and there is little prospect of practical or theoretical progress.

Neutral: The discussion offers potential advances, but they could be more robust or significant.

■ Agree: The discussion outlines the possibility of practical and theoretical advances.

Strongly agree: The discussion is clear and coherent, and it presents a cohesive position on the ways of advancing the topic in practical terms and through new research initiatives.

## 6. General Evaluation

Please provide a **qualitative assessment** of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be **as clear and specific as possible**. This space is also intended for **general comments** that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

The format of pensata and the new version of the manuscript are more suitable for publication.

I present some suggestions for the final version:

- a) detail acronyms - for example FTX
- b) insert sources when bringing information from other locations - e.g. topic 3.3, when citing the Odebrecht case, item 3.4 when citing the Goldman Sachs case, item 3.5, case cobalt , p. 9 when stating that Ethics is a core managerial competency and so on.
- c) At the end of sections, instead of putting in bold: conclusion of the section 3, .... present an essay, for example, in summary, to conclude....

With this, your text will become more reader friendly

## 7. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

- Approved.

## 8. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

- Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.
- Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.
- I do NOT agree to open the review.