Reviewer E:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

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

Yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes

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

Yes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology implemented in the study should be adequately discussed

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

Not devoid of errors

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

The conclusion of the study is totally missing. the author should be made to provide this important section of the paper

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is obsolete and inadequate

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

1

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

1

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1. The reviewed literature is not recent. the author should review studies from 2019 to 2023.

2. The gap in the literature regarding the research topic is not identified. The author should do well to identify the gap

3. The author should identify the particular theory that drives the study

4. The discussion of estimated results is not detailed enough to provide the relevant policy implications intended by the research.

5. The author should estimate the asymmetric mediating effect of quality management in innovation and competitiveness in the food processing industry of Cameroon using the ARDL method of estimation in addition to the already implemented methodology. This is provide a check of robustness of the estimated results needed for policy implications

6. The researcher has failed to empirically disentangle the relevant research hypothesis tested for validating the efficacy of effects of product, process and organizational innovations on competitiveness in food processing.

Reviewer L:
Recommendation: See Comments

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

The title is adequate and no changes are suggested.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

1) The abstract lacks specificity regarding the nature of innovation studied and the aspects of quality management considered.
2) As the abstract mentions a population of 2564 food processing companies, it doesn't provide information about the characteristics or distribution of these companies.
3) The abstract mentions the intensification of global and national competition but doesn't elaborate on the specific challenges or dynamics in the context of Cameroon.

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

The article contains some grammatical errors and should be submitted to proof reading before its publication.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The description of the sampling technique is brief and lacks details on how the sample was selected using the simple random sampling technique.

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

The following issues are found which need to be addressed:
1) This section results lacks information on how variables such as innovation, quality management, and competitiveness were measured, leading to potential ambiguity.
2) The section "discussion of the results" lacks a detailed interpretation of the results, particularly regarding the practical implications of the findings and their significance in the context of the food processing industry in Cameroon.
3) While some comparisons with existing studies are made, the discussion lacks depth in comparing the current findings with a broader range of relevant literature.
4) There are inconsistencies in the interpretation of results, such as stating "quality management positively and insignificantly affect process innovation and competitiveness," which is unclear and somehow contradictory.

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

The CONCLUSION section is missing! Anyway, the authors have included a section named RECOMMENDATIONS. In this sections the authors focus on the importance of innovation without addressing potential challenges or drawbacks associated with innovation implementation.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Some articles cited are outdated! The authors might consider substituting them with more coherent literature.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1) The abstract lacks specificity regarding the nature of innovation studied and the aspects of quality management considered. The authors might consider giving more details on the types of innovation (product, process, organizational) and specify quality management dimensions examined to enhance clarity.
2) As the abstract mentions a population of 2564 food processing companies, it doesn't provide information about the characteristics or distribution of these

companies. A description of the nature and distribution of the population is needed to provide context for the sample selection.

3) The abstract mentions the intensification of global and national competition but doesn't elaborate on the specific challenges or dynamics in the context of Cameroon. Therefore, a brief context or background on the challenges and dynamics of global and national competition in the food processing industry of Cameroon might be needed.

4) The description of the sampling technique is brief and lacks details on how the sample was selected using the simple random sampling technique. The authors might consider providing a more detailed explanation of the steps taken in the sampling process, including how companies were selected, potential biases, and efforts to ensure a representative sample.

5) The section 'results' lacks information on how variables such as innovation, quality management, and competitiveness were measured, leading to potential ambiguity. Please consider explaining briefly the measurement methods for key variables to ensure transparency and facilitate the replication of the study.

6) The section "discussion of the results" lacks a detailed interpretation of the results, particularly regarding the practical implications of the findings and their significance in the context of the food processing industry in Cameroon. The authors are suggested to provide a more comprehensive discussion, elaborating on the practical implications of the results for food processing companies in Cameroon.

7) While some comparisons with existing studies are made, the discussion lacks depth in comparing the current findings with a broader range of relevant literature. The authors are suggested to consider expanding the discussion by comparing the results not only with Kipchumba et al. (2021) but also with other studies in the field.

8) There are inconsistencies in the interpretation of results, such as stating "quality management positively and insignificantly affect process innovation and competitiveness," which is unclear and somehow contradictory. The authors are suggested to clarify and ensure the consistency in the interpretation of results.

9) The CONCLUSION section is missing! Anyway, the authors have included a section named RECOMMENDATIONS. In this sections the authors focus on the importance of innovation without addressing potential challenges or drawbacks associated with innovation implementation. For improvements they are suggested to acknowledge potential challenges or limitations in implementing innovations and provide strategies or considerations for overcoming these challenges.

Reviewer M:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title os adequate to the paper content.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The Abstract clearly presents the paper content.

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

There are a few grammatical errors. Please find the attached file, with some suggestions and comments.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

No objections.

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

The paper body is clear discussed. Please take in consideration the suggestions in the file.

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

The Conclusions is missing. Perhaps the authors have introduced it the disccusion. I would suggest to merge with reccomandations.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

There is no concern about the list of references.

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]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please find the comments and suggestions in the document file attached.