

Review Form2

Book Name:	Business, Management and Economics: Research Progress
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2494
Title of the Manuscript:	Sustainable Business Strategies for Tourism
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is crucial for the scientific community as it provides an in-depth exploration of corporate strategy, particularly in dynamic and volatile markets like tourism. It offers a comprehensive analysis of how Strategic Business Units (SBUs) play a pivotal role in guiding product and market decisions, emphasizing the need for flexibility, agility, and risk-taking in achieving sustainable organizational success. The detailed discussion on various expansion strategies, such as market penetration, diversification, and new market development, coupled with a focus on strategy formulation, implementation, and evaluation, makes it a valuable resource for both academics and practitioners. Additionally, the manuscript highlights the significance of interactive strategies, stakeholder management, and strategic controls, which are critical for sustaining competitive advantage in rapidly changing environments. The inclusion of real-world examples and strategic evaluation criteria further enhances its practical relevance, making it an indispensable guide for those involved in strategic planning and management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Sustainable Business Strategies for Tourism," is suitable but somewhat broad. It effectively conveys the focus on sustainability within the tourism industry, which is a key theme of the article. However, the article delve deep into strategic planning, adaptability, and competitive advantage in dynamic markets.The title could be more specific to highlight these aspects. Three alternative tiles are: 1. Strategic Sustainability in Tourism: Navigating Market Dynamics 2. Building Resilient Tourism Businesses: Sustainable Strategies for Success 3. Adaptive Strategies for Sustainable Growth in the Tourism Industry	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive and covers a wide range of key points related to corporate strategy, particularly in the context of sustainable business practices within the tourism industry. However, there are a few areas where the abstract could be improved for clarity, focus, and completeness: Clarity and Conciseness: 1. The abstract is somewhat dense, making it difficult to grasp the main points quickly. Consider simplifying the language and breaking down complex sentences to enhance readability. Focus on Key Themes: 2. The abstract touches on a wide range of topics (e.g., strategic planning, diversification, market dynamics, organizational structure), which dilute the focus of the study. Prioritize the most critical themes like sustainability, adaptability, and strategic planning.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure and subsections of the manuscript appear to be appropriate in general, but a few adjustments could enhance clarity and flow. Here are some observations and suggestions: 1. Consider adding more descriptive sub-section headings or sub-subsections within larger sections like "Strategy Formulation" and "Strategy Implementation" to make the document easier to navigate.	

Review Form2

	2. Ensure that each section flows logically into the next. For example, after discussing strategy formulation, the next logical step is implementation, followed by evaluation. This sequence is appropriate, but the transitions between sections could be made smoother with brief introductory sentences.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive coverage of key strategic concepts and methodologies relevant to business management, particularly within the tourism industry. It draws on well-established theories and frameworks, such as Porter's Five Forces, SWOT analysis, and the product life cycle, which are widely recognized in strategic management literature. The manuscript also integrates real-world examples and short case studies, enhancing its practical relevance and demonstrating the applicability of the theoretical concepts discussed. Additionally, the manuscript provides a thorough evaluation of strategic options, including suitability, acceptability, and feasibility, ensuring that the recommendations are grounded in solid analysis.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references provided in the manuscript appear to be a mix of academic, industry, and news sources, which can be useful for providing a comprehensive view of the topic. Few important observations relating to referencing are: 1. Some references are dated, such as Porter's works from 1996 and 1998, and other sources from the early 2000s. While Porter's works are foundational and widely cited so including it in the study is appropriate. It would be beneficial to include more recent studies or articles that reflect the current state of the industry, especially given the rapid changes in business strategies and the tourism sector. 2. It is suggested to include more references relating to related to sustainability in tourism, recent advancements in sustainable practices, and case studies of successful implementation in this sector.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality in the article is good in general. However, there is scope to improve it. In several places grammatical mistake are noticed. For example, last line of the heading title 'Developing new Products or Services' needs correction.	
Optional/General comments	1. The focus of the study is somewhat diluted. Although sustainable business strategies are discussed in details in the paper but the link with the tourism industry is not well established. The author should discuss sustainable business strategies in the wake of tourism industry to improve the flow of the paper. 2. The manuscript have not mentioned limitations of the study, elaborating on them could provide a more balanced perspective. Additionally, suggesting specific areas for future research could guide other scholars and add value to the academic community. 3. n.d. (No date) references should be avoided. For instance, Caputo. E (n.d.) is a no date reference. 4. The author can throw more light on the methodology part.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form2](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Purnendu Basu
Department, University & Country	ICFAI Business School, ICFAI Foundation for Higher Education, India