

**Paper: “Do Vertical Contracts Lead to Foreclosure and Efficiency Gains? An Empirical Study of the Food and Beverage Industry”**

**Submitted: 14 March 2024**

**Accepted: 03 May 2024**

**Published: 31 May 2024**

Corresponding Author: Silvia Bertarelli

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n13p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n13p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Murry Siyasiya  
Blantyre International University, Malawi

Reviewer 2: Róbert Szűcs  
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 3: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Yes. I suggest replacing 'or to' with 'and'

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

I suggest that 'or to' should be replaced with 'and' in the title.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Yes

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes, although not very clear. It's 3 out of 5.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

Yes

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Yes

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Yes

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

See attached reviewed paper!

-----

-----  
Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

There are no grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The CONCLUSION is accurate and supported by the content.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, no revision needed

## **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

-----  
-----  
Reviewer D:  
Recommendation: Accept Submission  
-----

### **The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title "Do vertical contracts lead to foreclosure or to efficiency gains? An empirical study of the food and beverage industry" is clear and adequately reflects the content of the article. It accurately conveys the central focus on the impact of vertical contracts within a specific industry, which the article discusses comprehensively.

### **The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract concisely presents the objective of the study, the methodology employed (case studies), and the key findings. It sets up the reader's expectation for a detailed empirical analysis of vertical contracts in the food and beverage industry, highlighting both the pro- and anti-competitive perspectives.

### **There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

The overall quality of writing is high, with only a few grammatical and spelling mistakes present. These do not significantly detract from the readability or the professionalism of the manuscript but are noticeable upon close reading.

### **The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methods section clearly describes the approach used to select case studies, the data sources, and the metrics (market share, CR4 ratio, HHI index) for analysis. The methodology is detailed and allows for reproducibility of the study, essential for scientific research.

### **The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The results are presented clearly, with detailed explanations of how the findings from the case studies relate to the broader theoretical framework. Tables and figures are well-utilized to illustrate points and support the text, facilitating an understanding of complex data.

### **The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusions are well-supported by the content presented in the article. They accurately reflect the empirical data and theoretical analysis discussed, providing a nuanced view of the effects of vertical contracts. The summary ties back to the study's objectives and highlights the significance of market asymmetry in determining the impact of these contracts.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The references are comprehensive, covering key literature and foundational studies relevant to the topic of vertical contracts and market dynamics. They are appropriately used throughout the article to support claims and situate the study within existing research.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, no revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Overall, this scientific article is of excellent quality, with its strengths lying in the clarity of its methods, the detailed presentation of its results, and the robustness of its analytical framework. The minor grammatical issues noted do not significantly impact the scientific value of the work.

-----