**Reviewer A**

*Per la redazione del* case study *occorre descrivere meglio le interviste ai manager, in particolare indicare il numero delle interviste effettuate, le domande poste e come sono stati analizzati i pezzi di testo (eventuale software utilizzato). Anche per quanto riguarda l’analisi dei siti web occorre indicare quali elementi sono stati presi in esame.*

* The paper already specifies the number of interviews to managers.

See p. 8: “The interviews were conducted with **the managers of three networks** in the “seismic crater”: a provincial museum network (Museum System of Macerata Province), an inter-municipal network (Sibillini Museum Network) and a multi-unit network (Sistini Museums of the Piceno region)”.

These three managers represent the three network typologies identified in the “seismic crater”.

* Given the short number of museum networks of the “seismic crater” as well as of the interviewees, **no software was used**. It should be noted that the interviews were **one of the tools used for the aim of the analysis, which also included the examination of the regional planning documents**.
* About questions, the paper already describes the content of the in-depth interviews:

See p. 7: “The analysis is supported by in-depth interviews of the managers of some museum networks in the “seismic crater”, with the aim of **shedding light on a number of important organisational issues, such as the level of internal and external cooperation**. The interviews adopted **closed and open questions and Likert scales**. The field research took place between September and December 2017, after the earthquakes that hit central Italy between 2016 and 2017[[1]](#footnote-1). For this reason, **the reaction to the earthquake, difficulties, critical issues and medium- and long-term perspectives suggested by the crater’s museum networks** were also investigated[[2]](#footnote-2)”.

* The analysis of the websites just aimed to verify if the information provided **was correct and updated**. As stated at p. 10: “With regard to this, **the failure to update websites could, for many of the networks, be interpreted as a shortage of skilled personnel for this kind of activity or a lack of shared activities to communicate – as if these networks were on a road to nowhere**. Either way, this is a significant hindrance for the development and innovation of museums with a contribution to make to the enhancement of the territory and its resources, as confirmed by the corporate visual identity of many of the museum networks investigated here”.

*Una descrizione più dettagliata della metodologia chiarirebbe meglio la costruzione del caso e consentirebbe di individuare i limiti dello studio nonché gli step futuri di ricerca. Infatti, sul piano metodologico sarebbe ad esempio interessante intervistare anche altri attori sociali come i privati che fanno parte delle reti territoriali e gli stessi visitatori.*

* As already argued, the interviews investigated the **level of internal and external cooperation**. As suggested by the reviewer, it could be interesting to interview visitors and external stakeholders. However, it was not the aim of the analysis discussed in this paper. The research aimed to analyse the “capacity of networks **for dealing organisational difficulties and implementing a proactive approach**”.
* For this reason, interviews were just a part of the methodology, which also focused on **regional planning**. See. § 4.2.2 Light and shade in regional cultural planning 2017-2019.

As specified in the first paragraph (p. 2): “The research goes over the key steps of the networking process through a qualitative research method in order to identify:

1. **the characteristics of the approaches used over the twenty-year period between the central Italy earthquakes of 1997 and 2016-2017;**
2. **the main hindrances to innovation of the museum offer;**
3. **possible strategies to promote long-lasting and effective networks.**

Finally, in order to reverse a long-standing shortage of planning and professional skills, a multi-level framework involving the state, the Regions and municipalities is mapped out”.

*Sebbene la letteratura sui network e la panoramica legislativa siano ampie e ben trattate, manca una sezione di letteratura sul marketing utile per formulare critiche e proposte relative all’offerta dei sistemi museali. Ad esempio il testo di Golinelli Claudia Maria “La valorizzazione del patrimonio culturale: verso la definizione di un modello di governance” (2008) Giuffrè editore, tratta la progettazione e la gestione di prodotti turistico-culturali in chiave sistemica includendo una lettura micro a livello di singolo museo e di network tra musei e tra musei e attori del sistema turistico. Peraltro vengono esaminate diverse tipologie di network e i “tematismi” ed anche il ruolo del pubblico e del privato nella governance di tali network.*

*Inoltre, è utile il capitolo di Francesco Casarin “Quale marketing per le organizzazioni culturali? Oltre l’approccio pluralistico” nel testo Rispoli e Brunetti (2009) “Economia e management delle aziende di produzione culturale”, Il Mulino. Il contributo evidenzia la necessità di adottare un approccio pluralistico, integrato di marketing transazionale, relazionale ed esperienziale per sviluppare offerte che soddisfino i visitatori e gli stakeholder in ambito culturale. Questo contributo apre al tema del marketing dell’esperienza e del marketing esperienziale che è stato trattato ampiamente in letteratura. Sul concetto di esperienza in ambito museale si veda ad esempio “Pencarelli T., Conti E., Splendiani S. (2017), “The experiential offering system of museums: evidence from Italy”, Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable development, Vol. 7, N. 4, p. 430-448. Il lavoro analizza come si progettano, gestiscono e comunicano le esperienze per i visitatori dei musei ovvero offerte dall’elevato valore aggiunto che si costruiscono su servizi di elevata qualità, mettendo in luce anche un tema affrontato ampiamente nel paper ovvero la qualificazione del personale del museo.*

*Un ampliamento della letteratura come sopra suggerito consentirebbe di arricchire ulteriormente la prospettiva di analisi e di conseguenza le implicazioni teoriche e manageriali. Ad esempio, sarebbe interessante comprendere meglio in fase di discussione dei risultati e di proposta di schema concettuale finale il ruolo del pubblico e del privato nella gestione di offerte esperienziali.*

I would like to thank the reviewer for the useful reference I included in the paper (Golinelli, 2008). However, I did not explore literature on experiential marketing, because it was not the focus of the analyses conducted in this paper.

The paper does not analyse marketing strategies adopted by museums, but aims to understand **the main gaps of twenty years of regional planning**. Therefore, it adopted a public management approach, considering networks as **a strategic management tool**. Even though networks are also a marketing tool, the analysis of this aspect was not the aim of the research. Moreover, the paper highlighted that many of the networks set up in the Marche Region are at a standstill or their activity has ceased. So, no marketing strategies could have been studied in this paper.

The innovative contribution the study would like to provide concern the results of the field research, which suggests a new multi-level approach.

See § 5, p. 12: “**An analysis of the twenty-year museum networking process in the Marche Region’s “seismic crater” highlights certain gaps related to a lack of strategic planning that we can find in many of the Region’s networks. The reward criterion which continues to drive regional cultural interventions can promote important projects and joint marketing activities, but does not affect the structural constraints of small museum institutions. The main weaknesses are not only related to a lack of qualified personnel, but also to a failure to provide them with steady employment, which could otherwise ensure the inner stability of the network**: «the length of management tenure facilitates trust building, knowledge diffusion in the network, and continuity in relationships, all factors that are likely to be conducive to a higher level of integration and therefore to network effectiveness»[[3]](#footnote-3).

In order to achieve inner stability, **a multi-level approach is required**, which involves museums, the Region and the state and combines top-down and bottom-up methods”.

See also **figure 1**.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Reviewer B**

*1) Page 4 - “tourism flows … (…), with negative and non-negligible results.”*

*What do results, that are negative and/or non-negligible, refer to?*

Negative and non-negligible results are explained in the sentence which follows. They refer both to the effects of overtourism – in terms of threats for tourism sustainability, quality of life, quality of tourism experience and destination reputation – and to the low enhancement of other areas.

The sentence has been modified replacing “results” with “effects”. A footnote has also been added: “Moreover, as already highlighted by the SPT 2017-2022, despite the actions undertaken to date, tourist flows continue to be directed to the main national destinations, with more than 60% of international arrivals in 2014 concentrated in only 4 regions – namely, Veneto, Lombardy, Tuscany and Lazio[[4]](#footnote-4), with negative and non-negligible **effects**. On the one hand, some art cities such as Venice run the **risk of overtourism[[5]](#footnote-5)**; on the other, large areas of the country are not yet able to fully exploit their potential, which lies in the wealth and dissemination of cultural heritage and could be an important pull factor for the tourism demand in Italy[[6]](#footnote-6).”

*2) Page 6 – “Currently, as confirmed by recent data published by the Italian National Institute of Statistics, 42.5% of Italian museums are involved in museum networks or systems, in order to share human, technological and financial resources. Given the large number of public museums involved in networks (72.6%), it is increasingly important to understand their capacity for dealing organisational difficulties and implementing a proactive approach.”*

*Why is this important? Possibly, their inefficiency arises from the fact that public bodies usually manage them? In other words, is there a role for the quality of public management of cultural resources? How networking, as suggested later, may overcome the organizational difficulties? Some more words could be useful for the reader.*

It is important to verify the *effectiveness* and *efficiency* of networks, because the number of networks is increasing. Their inefficiency has to be verified. As specified at the beginning of the paragraph, networking may overcome organizational difficulties: networks “allow museums to achieve the efficient boundaries of their various activities, thus solving the dimensional problems which affect small institutions. In particular, thanks to their involvement in networks, museums could achieve better results in the three areas identified in Moore’s Strategic Triangle […] Following this approach and paraphrasing what Gulati *et al.* say about interfirm strategic networks, we can argue that strategic museum networks are organisations which «potentially provide a [museum] with access to information, resources, markets, and technologies; with advantages from learning, scale, and scope economies; and allow [museums] to achieve strategic objectives, such as sharing risks and outsourcing value-chain stages and organizational functions»[[7]](#footnote-7)”.

This sentence has been added: “**From an accountability perspective it would allow to measure and evaluate the quality and effectiveness of public management**”.

*3) At the beginning of page 7 it might be important to remind, even in few words, that the series of seismic events, as an exogenous shock, can be viewed as a “natural experiment” and it can help to gauge the resilience of the network. In this perspective, the fact that you have both networks inside the crater and outside it is important.*

A sentence has been added. “For this reason, the reaction to the earthquake, difficulties, critical issues and medium- and long-term perspectives suggested by the crater’s museum networks were also investigated[[8]](#footnote-8). **As an exogenous shock, the earthquake can be considered as a “natural experiment” which helps to gauge the resilience of museum networks**”.

1. The field research is part of a wider project \*\*\*. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. **The interviews focused on different dimensions. Only some of them are considered for the purpose of this article**. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Turrini *et al.* 2010, p. 542. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. MiBACT 2017, p. 27. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. **See threats for: tourism sustainability, quality of life, quality of tourism experience and destination reputation.** [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Banca d’Italia 2018, p. 10. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Gulati *et al.* 2000. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. The interviews focused on different dimensions. Only some of them are considered for the purpose of this article. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)