

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

**Submitted: 16 January 2024**

**Accepted: 29 May 2024**

**Published: 31 May 2024**

Corresponding Author: Mandala Nerbert

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n13p167](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n13p167)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer A:  
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review  
-----

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

The title describes exactly the content of the article

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

The Abstract should follow a defined style that sets out the goals, objectives, methods, results and generalizations in separate proposals. You have to add a keyword.

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

Very good use of grammar and spelling.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The research methodology is confusing

The only method mentioned is the literature review

The authors have not carried out any kind of systematic literature review.

The authors have not used clear inclusion criteria

The concept of efficiency does not seem to be understood by the authors.

The authors have not applied any reliable method to avoid the risk of bias.

The authors should further elaborate on the methodology, using a standard (e.g. PRISMA guide)

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

The bibliographical references in the theoretical part are poor.

the authors should add more references to the theoretical part.

The results are mixed with the discussion.

The authors do not use methods for visualising the results.

Results should be visualised in tables or figures.

Results should be completely separated from the discussion.

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

Results should be completely separated from the discussion.

In general, this manuscript seems to try to imitate some paper style.

It does not analyze the concepts considered and the relationships between them.

The authors should rewrite the manuscript with emphasis on the above.

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

The references are carefully selected.  
However, the bibliography should follow a strictly defined style (APA style) and references should be completely homogeneous.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

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

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

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

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

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

5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

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

1

*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]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

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

The authors should further elaborate on the methodology, using a standard (e.g. PRISMA guide)

Results should be visualised in tables or figures.

Results should be completely separated from the discussion.

In general, this manuscript seems to try to imitate some other paper style.

It does not analyze the concepts considered and the relationships between them.

The authors should rewrite the manuscript with emphasis on the above.

-----

-----

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

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

The title accurately reflects the content of the paper and clearly conveys the main topic of the article, which is the impact of technology adoption on efficiency and transparency in public procurement processes in Kenya.

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

The abstract provides a clear overview of the paper's objectives, methods, and results. It briefly summarizes the key points of the paper and effectively conveys the importance of the research.

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

The paper is well-written and there are only a few minor grammatical errors and spelling mistakes throughout the article.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The study methods are clearly explained, including the search strategy used to identify relevant studies, the inclusion and exclusion criteria, and the data extraction process. The methods are appropriate for a systematic review and the author provides a detailed description of the process used to identify and select studies for inclusion. This is good exploratory research, desk research.

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

The article does not contain any primary results. There is one major error in the paper: "The study employed qualitative research method using a systematic literature review also referred to as desktop research." No, this is not qualitative research, this is a simple literature review. A qualitative research would be a primary research but it is not true.

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

The conclusions are well-supported by the content of the paper and effectively summarize the key findings. The authors offer insightful recommendations for the future.

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

The references are comprehensive and appropriately cited throughout the paper. The authors draw on a wide range of sources to support their arguments and provide a comprehensive review of the existing literature on the topic.

*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]

3

*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):**

Please fix the qualitative research.  
The paper would be complete with primary research.