

Review of: "Examining Sustainable Survival Tactics for Small-Scale Bakeries: A Case Study in Lagos State"

Mercy E. Ogbari¹

¹ Covenant University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. **Originality:** The researcher's background is good, but I have issues with the citation and references. The researchers should ensure they include current and adequate citation and references in this study. You will need to refer to your work with the view of other researchers.

The gap in the study should be well spelt out.

Their problem should be properly indicated; it is different from the research objective.

The research questions should be included.

1. **Relationship to literature:** There is no adequate understanding of the literature, so there should be more improvement on this. What are the key ideas and theories that supported this paper? Relevant theories should be stated.

The researchers should rewrite the literature review with adequate citation/references.

The United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (?).needs citation and clarity

The Industrial Research Unit of Obafemi Awolowo University (?).needs citation and clarity and what about it

1. **Methodology:** The methodology was not well stated; the research design is missing. What period or years did it take to get the research work done? What informed your choice of the numbers of despondents? There was no informed consent in the paper. What is the basis of the population chosen? What is your sample size?
2. **Results:** The results were not properly analyzed. It is important to note that the researcher/s' efforts should be aimed towards not only the solution, but also towards how the findings/results can be generalized. The discussion of findings should be separated from the results and go in line with the stated objectives, at least paragraph by paragraph. Check the template.
3. **Implications for research, practice, and/or society:** The paper clearly identified the implications for research, practice, and/or society. From the discussions, did the **not** researcher/s bridge the gap between theory and practice? Importantly, the implications are **not** consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper.
4. **Quality of Communication:** There is clarity of expression and readability.

5. Recommendations:

The researcher should make necessary corrections.