

Editor's Comment:

The paper addresses an important and timely topic, investigating the specifics of business planning in the food and beverages sector. However, the manuscript is not free from certain flaws, including critical ones.

In the Abstract, the author should demonstrate the overall relevance of the topic, then proceed with the specific relevance for a specific territory (not indicated properly in the study). The gaps in theory and practice must be demonstrated, and the author must explain how the study aims to bridge those gaps. The methods must be presented clearly, then major findings, and then implications of the findings and potential contributions of the study to the literature. A brief and focused text is needed here, a couple of sentences per issue.

In the Introduction, the above pattern should be expanded and detailed. There should be an extensive discussion of gaps. Currently, the Introduction section is extremely short, the main focus of the narrative is blurred. The recommendation is to expand the text, emphasize the overall relevance of the topic for a wider community of countries. The aim should be summarized, and the selection of variables in the Methods must be linked with both the gaps and the aim. All of the above components are now extremely weak. Currently, the author presents no discussion of gaps, that is why the relevance of the study is not convincing. The Literature Review section actually does not review any literature sources, no citations are provided, there is no a comprehensive narrative-oriented critical review.

In terms of the methodology, the author should improve the presentation of the methods. There should be a critical discussion of the parameters with accepting proper metrics and rejecting improper ones. The author should critically discuss methods and demonstrate why those particular methods are proper ones for this study. Examples of previous studies would be helpful. The author must refer to the limitations and disadvantages of the method and discuss them to ensure the reliability of results. Also, the contribution of the author to adjusting the method to the specific study is not certain.

Overall, the author's findings, novel narratives, and contributions to the literature are uncertain. The narrative flow could be greatly improved to elaborate the methodology, demonstrate the results, and emphasize the author's findings. The Results section must be structured, a table or a figure demonstrating major findings in a reader-friendly format is vitally needed. The wordy text does not allow a reader to track the findings, to check them against survey questions and the aim of the study.

To my mind, without a clear presentation of the methodology, as well as without a comprehensive discussion of the findings, a paper can not be considered for publication. The discussion component of the study is rather weak. The Discussion section is almost missing. The author should consider separating results from discussion. The Discussion section is to demonstrate the novelty of the findings, the author should discuss the differences of the findings from those made by other scholars, as well as point out the similarities.

In the Conclusion, the author should address potential limitations, avenues for further research, and how the findings could be applied in a broader context.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Vasilii Erokhin
School of Economics and Management, Harbin Engineering University, China.