



Ni Made Estiyanti <estiyanti@primakara.ac.id>

FW: Frontiers: Independent Review Report Submitted - 1034010

1 message

Estiyanti Ni Made <nimadeestiyanti@mailbox.unideb.hu>
To: "estiyanti@primakara.ac.id" <estiyanti@primakara.ac.id>

Sat, Aug 26, 2023 at 10:08 PM

From: Dr. Máté Domicián <mate.domician@eng.unideb.hu>
Sent: Saturday, August 26, 2023 9:23 PM
To: Estiyanti Ni Made <nimadeestiyanti@mailbox.unideb.hu>
Subject: Fwd: Frontiers: Independent Review Report Submitted - 1034010[Androidos Outlookból küldve](#)

From: Frontiers In Sustainable Food Systems Editorial Office <sustainablefoodsystems.editorial.office@frontiersin.org>
Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 1:10:44 PM
To: Dr. Máté Domicián <mate.domician@eng.unideb.hu>
Subject: Frontiers: Independent Review Report Submitted - 1034010

Dear Dr Máté,

Frontiers In Sustainable Food Systems Editorial Office has sent you a message. Please click 'Reply' to send a direct response

A new review report has been submitted by a reviewer in the interactive review forum of your manuscript. Please read through this report, and for further actions see the "What do I need to do now?" section below.

Please click here to access this manuscript directly:

<http://www.frontiersin.org/Review/EnterReviewForum.aspx?activationno=18b7d783-9c0c-4f76-9d31-abd97ce57933&retab=1>

Journal: Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems, section Social Movements, Institutions and Governance

Article type: Original Research

Manuscript title: The Impacts of Sustainable Industrial Revolution (IR) on Food Corporate Profitability

Manuscript ID: 1034010

Authors: Domicián Máté, Judit Prof. Dr. Oláh, Edina Erdei, Ni Made Estiyanti, Zoltán Bács, Sándor Kovács

Submitted on: 01 Sep 2022

Interactive review started on: 13 Sep 2022

Best regards,

Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems
Frontiers | Editorial Office - Collaborative Peer Review Team
www.frontiersin.org
[Avenue du Tribunal Fédéral 34](#)
Lausanne, Switzerland | T 41 21 510 1793

For technical issues, please contact our IT Helpdesk (support@frontiersin.org) or visit our Frontiers Help Center (zendesk.frontiersin.org/hc/en-us)

What do I need to do now?

If you have not yet responded to the other reviewers, please submit your responses to all referees and/or revised manuscript within 14 days.

If you have already responded to any other reviewers, please submit your response to this referee and/or revised manuscript within one (1) week.

All interactions take place within the review forum for this manuscript, where you can re-submit manuscripts and post comments to the reviewers, which will be visible to all participants of the forum. You can also send private messages within the forum to the Associate Editor or Editorial Office. The Frontiers interactive review forum is designed to allow speedy and efficient interaction through comments between authors, reviewers and the associate editor.

Independent Review Report, Reviewer 1

EVALUATION

Please list your revision requests for the authors and provide your detailed comments, including highlighting limitations and strengths of the study and evaluating the validity of the methods, results, and data interpretation. If you have additional comments based on Q2 and Q3 you can add them as well.

The paper investigates interesting and very relevant research questions. However, in my opinion, it needs to be substantially improved. So far, there are problems in practically each section, from introduction through theory to discussion. The research problem needs to be better justified. The conceptual model requires more theoretical elaboration, i.e. the hypotheses have to be more carefully and in-depth justified. The empirical setting, i.e. food industry, has almost not been addressed and remains a 'black box' e.g. with regard to the role and areas of application of IR technologies in this sector. The method used seems to be well-suited but additional information is needed to be able to verify that. The results should be interpreted more carefully in the discussion section while their practical implications need to be stronger addressed. Overall, the paper cannot be published in its current form and requires a major revision. Please see the attached file for my detailed comments to the authors.

Check List

a. Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes

b. Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

No

c. Are the statistical methods valid and correctly applied? (e.g. sample size, choice of test)

Yes

d. Is a statistician required to evaluate this study?

Yes

e. Are the methods sufficiently documented to allow replication studies?

No

QUALITY ASSESSMENT:

Rigor

2

Quality of the writing

3

Overall quality of the content

2

Interest to a general audience

4