



OPEN PEER REVIEW

Regulatory Challenges and Opportunities in the Cannabis Industry

Sepehr. Khajeh Naeeni^{1,2*} , Nilofar. Nouhi² 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@lakeheadu.ca

Received: 2024-02-26

Revised: 2024-03-20


Accepted: 2024-03-27

Published: 2024-04-01

EDITOR:Shehzad Raj 


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

shehzadraj@geomatika.edu.my

REVIEWER 1:Zeynep Karal 

Department of Computer and Instructional Technologies Education, Trabzon University, Trabzon, Türkiye

zeynepkaral@trabzon.edu.tr

REVIEWER 2:Thanuja Kulasooriya 

Department Soil Science, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Ruhuna, Mapalana, Kamburupitiya, Sri Lanka

thkulasooriya@soil.ruh.ac.lk

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The subsection on regulatory complexity effectively outlines various challenges but lacks specific examples that connect these abstract descriptions to real-world scenarios or case studies. Adding case studies that illustrate these complexities could provide clearer insight and stronger support for your arguments.

The manuscript mentions several key studies but often fails to critically engage with their findings or discuss how they relate to your new data. For example, the reference to Borodovsky and Budney (2018) could be expanded to discuss how their findings compare to the new themes emerging from your interviews.

This section would benefit from a more nuanced analysis. The current description of stakeholder views is broad. A deeper exploration into how these perspectives differ by stakeholder type (e.g., growers vs. policymakers) could provide more insightful analysis.

While NVivo is mentioned as the tool used for data analysis, the manuscript would be improved by providing more details about the coding process. How were codes developed? Were they derived inductively, deductively, or a combination of both? This information would enhance the reader's understanding of the methodological rigor.

It's commendable that the manuscript highlights innovation within the industry; however, the connection between regulatory changes and specific types of innovation is somewhat vague. Providing concrete examples of how regulation has directly spurred innovation would strengthen this section.

The discussion on economic contributions is compelling but somewhat one-dimensional. Consider incorporating a discussion on the potential negative economic impacts or challenges to provide a balanced view of the socio-economic landscape.

The conclusion suggests future research directions but lacks specificity regarding the methodologies or particular areas that need exploration. Suggest specific geographic or demographic studies that could provide comparative insights into the regulatory impacts discussed

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The introduction sets a broad context but jumps quickly between global implications and specific regulatory issues without clear transitions. A more structured introduction with explicit connection lines between global trends and specific regulatory challenges would improve readability.

There is inconsistent use of terms related to the cannabis industry. For instance, "cannabis products" and "cannabis-related products" are used interchangeably. Standardizing terminology throughout the manuscript would improve professional tone and clarity.

The description of participant demographics is thorough, but the rationale for choosing these particular demographics is missing. Clarify why these specific demographics (age, role in the industry) are relevant to the study's objectives.

While the findings section is detailed, it largely reports the perspectives without critical analysis. Integrate a discussion on how these findings align or contrast with existing theories or studies to deepen the analytical value of the work.

The discussion on policy implications is a strong point of the paper. This could be enhanced by specific recommendations for policymakers based on the study findings. For example, what exact changes would you recommend to current policies?

Some references appear to be outdated or not directly relevant to the paper's core themes. Update the literature review to include more recent studies, particularly those published in the last three years, to ensure the research's relevance and comprehensiveness.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.