Paper: **"The expansion of Vending in the Automated Retail Sector: An experiential marketing approach to customer acquisition-The Italian experience of MatiPay Srl"**

Corresponding Author: Arianna Di Vittorio

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Davide Calandra
University of Turin, Italy

Reviewer 2: Enida Pulaj
University of Vlora, Albania

Date Manuscript Received: 21.08.2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 08.09.2025
Manuscript Title: The expansion of Vending in the Automated Retail Sector. An experiential marketing approach to customer acquisition. Case study of MatiPay Srl - Italy	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0904/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:
Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title is clear and adequate to the content of the paper.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
The abstract needs to be revised. There is no reference to methodology such as literature review, case study design, data sources, analytical framework. The only methodological element in the abstract is the case history of MatiPay Srl, but even that is descriptive without research design. The text does not fully function as a research abstract. It reads more like an introductory overview.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
"...providing a competitive alternative to traditional brick-and-mortar stores by offering a diverse and consistently available selection of products. This makes them a competitive alternative to traditional brick-and-mortar stores." The second sentence repeats the first idea	

almost word-for-word. Grammar is correct, but a few sentences could be made more concise and academic. *The paper needs to be formatted.*	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
No explicit methodology section. The article describes trends, benefits, and applications of vending machines, and later presents a case history of MatiPay Srl. However, it never explains how the information was gathered (for example: literature review, surveys, interviews, or case study framework).	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
The authors have to cite more relevant literature (for example the last 5 years references)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**x**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Reviewer Name: Davide Calandra	
University/Country: University of Turin	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: The expansion of Vending in the Automated Retail Sector. An experiential marketing approach to customer acquisition. Case study of MatiPay Srl - Italy	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:	

Evaluation Criteria:
Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
Just a simple suggestion. I would like to invite to remove this part. Case study of MatiPay Srl - Italy	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**4**
They are relevant.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
Generally readable but numerous issues (capitalization, punctuation, and diction). Examples: double spaces ("Brand Identity"), Italian words left in English text ("Up-selling e Cross-	

selling"), and misspellings in references (e.g., "Harward Business School Press" in Pine & Gilmore entry; header "Bibliografy"; "Sitografy").	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**2**
The method should better finalized. No research questions/hypotheses, sampling frame, data collection/cleaning, variable definitions, or analytic procedures. The case study protocol (if any), triangulation, and reliability/validity checks are absent.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**3**
Results are mainly narrative claims with illustrative percentages but limited analytical depth. Several issues: "Automated retail… experienced 20% growth over the last five years" lacks a citation and context. *Figures are referenced but many appear as text placeholders without underlying data/units; numbering is inconsistent (two "Fig.6"). The distribution of "business opportunities closed" across 2021–2024 sums to 105%, suggesting rounding or calculation issues (42+20+32+11).* *Key metrics (NPS, CLTV, RPR, etc.) are defined but not actually computed on the dataset.*	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
Yes. Probably you can strengthen a little bit the implications part for theory and practitioners.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**2**
The list mixes textbooks, trade pieces, and general websites; several entries are outdated or loosely tied to claims. "Sitografy" includes generic portals (e.g., JNTO, MIT Atlas) that are not used in-text. There is a mismatch between in-text mentions (e.g., "Confida (2024)") and the listed source (Confcommercio–Confida 2023 PDF), and inconsistent formatting.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**X**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	