

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Understanding Compliance with Environmental Regulations in the Manufacturing Sector

Sepehr Khajeh Naeeni^{1, 2*}¹ Department of Chemical Engineering, Lakehead University, 955 Oliver Road, Thunder Bay, ON P7B 5E1, Canada² Department of Management, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada

* Corresponding author email address: skhajeh@kmanresce.ca

Received: 2023-11-06

Revised: 2023-12-14

Accepted: 2023-12-22

Published: 2024-01-01

EDITOR:

Shehzad Raj

School of Law, Universiti Geomatika Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

shehzadraj@geomatika.edu.my

REVIEWER 1:

Yuyu Zheng

School of International Relations, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, London, United Kingdom

yuyuzheng@gmail.com

REVIEWER 2:

Vanessa Indama

Public Administration Department, Basilan State College, Isabela City, Basilan, Philippines

vanesindama@gmail.com

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the Regulatory Awareness section, consider adding comparative analysis with regulations in different geographical regions. This could provide insights into the variability of compliance challenges and strategies internationally.

In the Compliance Strategies section, delve deeper into specific technologies used for compliance. Discuss the adoption barriers, costs, and the impact of these technologies on operational efficiency.

Provide case examples of the operational impacts mentioned. Real-world examples of production delays or workflow disruptions caused by compliance efforts could illustrate these challenges more vividly.

Under Staff Compliance, add a detailed discussion on training programs and incentives that have proven effective in enhancing compliance adherence among staff. This could include behavioral or psychological strategies that foster a compliance-oriented culture.

Broaden the section on Future Directions by proposing specific longitudinal studies that could verify the long-term impacts of compliance strategies observed in this study. Mention potential funding sources or collaborations that could support such research.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The introduction could be strengthened by directly linking the study's objectives with the theoretical frameworks that guide it. For instance, it would help to reference specific theories or models about regulatory compliance and strategic management within the introduction to frame your analysis.

Expand the review of related studies by discussing the limitations of previous work and how this study aims to address those gaps. For instance, mention specific regulatory compliance frameworks and their shortcomings as identified in earlier research.

Increase the robustness of the methodology section by providing more details on the interview guide. It would be beneficial to include examples of the interview questions, which would allow readers to assess the potential for bias or leading questions in your data collection process.

While NVivo is mentioned for data analysis, the specific analytical techniques used within NVivo should be elaborated. Clarify whether thematic analysis involved a grounded theory approach, deductive coding, or another specific method, and justify the choice.

Enhance the results section by linking the findings more explicitly to the research questions. Consider using direct quotes from participants to highlight critical findings and to bring the voice of your respondents into the narrative more effectively.

The discussion could be improved by tying the findings back to the literature reviewed earlier in the paper. This would strengthen the argument by showing how the results support or contradict existing theories and studies.

Provide a deeper exploration of the implications of the findings for both practice and future research. Additionally, address potential biases and limitations more critically, such as the sample size and selection, to give a balanced view of the study's robustness.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.