

Review of: "Vicious cycles and questions without answers"

Rohny Saylor¹

¹ Washington State University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Below, I have outlined my comments and suggestions.

1. Theoretical background and literature review: It is crucial for any academic paper to be grounded in a solid theoretical background and to engage with relevant literature in the field. Your paper lacks an adequate literature review that discusses existing theories and research in the area of agent decision-making, habits, and vicious cycles. Engaging with relevant literature will provide context and make your contribution to the field more evident (Gartner, 2001; Suddaby, 2010). I recommend that you review and cite relevant literature from journals such as *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *Organizational Research Methods*, and *Small Business Economics*.

2. Clarification of key terms and concepts: The manuscript often introduces key terms and concepts without clear definitions or explanations. For example, the meaning of "forced conclusion," "symptom," and "nature" needs further clarification. Providing clear explanations of these terms and explaining how they relate to existing theories and research will improve the overall quality of the paper (Boje, 2001).

3. Practical implications and examples: The paper would be significantly enriched by providing real-world examples and discussing the practical implications of the proposed framework for agents, organizations, or entrepreneurs. This would help the readers grasp the significance of your work and its potential for impact on practice (Edmondson and McManus, 2007; Zahra et al., 2009).

4. Structure and flow: The paper's structure and flow could be improved by organizing the content in a more coherent manner. For instance, the introduction could better outline the paper's purpose, research question, and contribution to the field (Boje, 2001). Additionally, the discussion and conclusions should summarize the main findings, implications, and future research directions (Suddaby, 2010).

In conclusion, while your efforts to contribute to the field with a novel framework are commendable, there are several areas that need to be addressed to improve the paper's quality and clarity. I encourage you to revise the manuscript by addressing the concerns raised above and resubmit for further consideration. Good luck with the revisions.

References:

Boje, D. M. (2001). *Narrative methods for organizational & communication research*. Sage.

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Graebner, M. E. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 25-32.

- Edmondson, A. C., & McManus, S. E. (2007). Methodological fit in management field research. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), 1155-1179.
- Gartner, W. B. (2001). Is there an elephant in entrepreneurship? Blind assumptions in theory development. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 25(4), 27-39.
- Gartner, W. B., Davidsson, P., & Zahra, S. A. (2012). Are you talking to me? The nature of community in entrepreneurship scholarship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(3), 321-331.
- Suddaby, R. (2010). Editor's comments: Construct clarity in theories of management and organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(3), 346-357.
- Yin, R. K. (2017). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. Sage publications.
- Zahra, S. A., Newey, L. R., & Li, Y. (2009). On the frontiers: The implications of social entrepreneurship for international entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(5), 1011-1027.