

Review of: "Open Source: The Case of Channels"

Arash Apornak¹

¹ University of Tehran

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

It is an awesome title that can be promoted by adding some new things to the paper that I suggested as follows:

1. The abstract is loosely written. It is not as informative as expected. A standard abstract must present, without leaving any doubt, the objective of the paper precisely; source of data (which is not present in your abstract) and analytical approach used; key findings, and any policy implications and recommendations. 2. The English and writing of the manuscript should be significantly improved. Pay careful attention to punctuation and articles. 3. The introduction does not precisely construct the research problem tackled and does not show how the problem is taken care of. 4. The authors ignored many recent papers in the area. 5. The implications of the results should be discussed in more detail. The authors should provide managerial insights based on the output. 6. The provided results in figures are not explained well. It is important to present your analysis from numerical results in a better way. 7. What is the gap in research of your work? Write about one paragraph at the end of the literature review.