

Review of: "A Study of Benchmarking and Corporate Strategic Behavior Adjustment from the Perspective of Individual Advantage Manifestation"

Stavros Sindakis¹

¹ Hellenic Open University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

After careful consideration and review, we request major amendments to this manuscript before accepting it for publication.

Abstract

A good informative abstract acts as a surrogate for the work itself. The researcher presents and explains the paper's main arguments, significant results, and evidence. An informative abstract includes the information found in a descriptive abstract [purpose, methods, scope]. However, it also consists of a judgment or comment about the study's validity, reliability, or completeness, the results and conclusions of the research, and the author's recommendations.

Introduction

The introduction does not adequately discuss how and why you planned to conduct this research, what the future benefits of this research will be to upcoming scholars, and what the findings of this study are. Make sure to:

1. Establish an area to research by highlighting the importance of the topic, and/or making general statements about the topic, and/or presenting an overview of current research on the subject.
2. Identify a research niche by opposing an existing assumption, and/or revealing a gap in existing research, and/or formulating a research question or problem, and/or continuing a disciplinary tradition.
3. Place your research within the research niche by stating the intent of your study, outlining the key characteristics of your research, describing important results, and giving a brief overview of the structure of the paper.

Literature Review

The literature review appears incomplete, is not critical, nor is there sufficient academic support for the arguments in the article. There is a lack of critical synthesis of the studies reviewed in the literature review, i.e., the literature review appears to be descriptive rather than a critical analysis of the examined studies. The critical evaluation of each work should consider:

- Provenance -- what are the author's credentials? Are the author's arguments supported by evidence [e.g., primary

historical material, case studies, narratives, statistics, recent scientific findings]?

- Methodology -- were the techniques used to identify, gather, and analyze the data appropriate to addressing the research problem? Was the sample size appropriate? Were the results effectively interpreted and reported?
- Objectivity -- is the author's perspective even-handed or prejudicial? Is contrary data considered, or is certain pertinent information ignored to prove the author's point?
- Persuasiveness -- which of the author's theses are most convincing or least convincing?
- Value -- are the author's arguments and conclusions convincing? Does the work ultimately contribute to an understanding of the subject in any significant way?

Also, create a narrative supporting the research gaps identified in the literature.

Analysis of Findings

Although the Results section provides a detailed description of the data collected, there needs to be a more critical synthesis and comparison of the findings in the analysis of the results.

Discussion

The Discussion lacks a critical synthesis and comparison of the primary data with the literature. The purpose of the discussion section is to interpret and describe the significance of your findings in relation to what was already known about the research problem being investigated and explain any new understanding or insights that emerged from your research. The discussion connects to the introduction through the research questions or hypotheses and the literature you reviewed. The Discussion should include a critical synthesis and comparison of the data with the literature. The discussion clearly explains how your study advanced the reader's understanding of the research problem from where you left them at the end of your review of prior research. The content of the discussion section of your paper should include:

- Explanation of results: Comment on whether the results were expected for each set of findings; go into greater depth to explain unexpected or incredibly profound findings. If appropriate, note any unusual or unanticipated patterns or trends that emerged from your results and explain their meaning concerning the research problem.
- References to previous research: Either compare your results with the findings from other studies or use the studies to support a claim. This can include re-visiting key sources already cited in your literature review section or saving them from citing later in the discussion section if they are more important to compare with your results instead of being a part of the general literature review of prior research used to provide context and background information.
- Deduction: A claim for how the results can be applied more generally. For example, describing lessons learned, proposing recommendations that can help improve a situation, or highlighting best practices.
- Hypothesis: A more general claim or possible conclusion arising from the results [which may be proved or

disproved in subsequent research]. This can be framed as new research questions that emerged from your analysis.

Conclusion

The Conclusion does not adequately discuss the theoretical and managerial implications of the study. Summarize your thoughts and convey the larger significance of your research. Identify and discuss how a gap in the literature has been addressed and demonstrate the importance of your ideas. Introduce possible new or expanded ways of thinking about the research problem.

Also, state the ideas for future research in the conclusion. Make sure you create 3 subsections in the Conclusion: 1) Theoretical implications, 2) Managerial Implications, and 3) Ideas for Future Research.

You may wish to study published articles that examine perspectives on this topic, which will give you an idea of how you must revise your article.

The paper is not following the journal's guidelines required for publication. Make sure to proofread the manuscript before it is resubmitted to the journal. Please go through the journal's guidelines thoroughly and revise the paper accordingly.