Decision Support for Foodbank South Africa

Reviewer feedback: Issues that need attention
(i) The abbreviation FBCT is used towards the end of section 2.1, nowhere in the text is there an indication of what this stands for. The abbreviation is explained in the abstract, but I would suggest it is done in the text as well.
(ii) In the last sentence of section 2.1 the abbreviation RDs is used – no idea what this is at this point. No explanation given, etc. It is only given in the next section although not very explicitly especially early on. Root definition is in the heading of section 2.2 but then RD is defined without saying that RD is actually Root definition – correct please.
(iii) The whole explanation of CATWOE and then PQR is not very clear – please attend to this? I just found it difficult to follow. How does the two relate, why is this given? (I know it is the methodology and it address the various actors/issues but the two things are just not properly explained.)
(iv) Throughout the paper there is reference to author (the author this, the author that – nothing wrong with this) However the paragraph starting with “After initial meetings held with representatives from FBSA, subsequent meetings with…” the term “practitioner” is used. Is this the author or somebody else? If it is the author why suddenly switch to calling him/her practitioner? Not clear – please attend too this?
(v) Just a sentence or two further it is stated “..RDs for each of the stakeholders were built..”. I am querying the use of the word “built” – does one not “compile” a definition or “construct”? Maybe I am too pedantic.
(vi) The paragraph starting: “The environmental constraints….” refers. I have a problem with environmental – it has a certain connotation in the way it is commonly used - it has something to do with the environment (trees, bushes, rivers, etc. etc.) Should one not use the term “resource constraints.. to me it seems as if this is what is being referred too.
(vii) NPO is not defined. (None Profit Organisation??) Please add this.
(viii) In this same paragraph towards the middle and end of the paragraph there is first reference to FBCT, in fact, the entire paragraph refers to FBCT and then suddenly there is reference to FBSA. I understand that the intention is that what is being developed for FBCT will be taken over or be used in the rest of FBSA. This whole issue, and here I mean the way this issue, is described needs a careful relook. When I read this piece I was just suddenly confused when FBSA was being mentioned. I’m pointing this out maybe one can relook at the way this is being conveyed.
(ix) Again I have an issue with terminology – the use of the word transformation. The term again has a certain connotation in South Africa and it could be confusing the way it is being used here. What about “change” – it means the same I believe and it cuts out this possible confusion.
(x) Line 3 in para starting: We used the above framework…. It says “the support provided to by FBCT” should it not just be “the support provided by FBCT”?
(xi) Next sentence: I propose: The primary intended of the changes are improving the accuracy, efficiency, fairness of the allocation system. (take out the “and” and use changes).
(xii) Little bit further - ..a higher percentage of satisfied needs…. (needs instead of need)
(xiii) The rest of the paragraph is again a bit confusing; try to make it more cleared.
(xiv) Last sentence of this section - …do this without within their… take out without.
(xv) Section 3.1 line 6/7 – two “depicts” almost straight after each other – use show or presents for the second one(?)
(xvi) Section 3.1 2nd para, 2nd line – layer is of,,take out of.
(xvii) Last sentence before Figure 4: It seems as if a space is required beteen ..existing agency.Upon..
(xviii) Last para of the paper – “They planned… “ surely this should read “They plan…”
(xviii) Has this now been implemented in FBCT – if it has state it a bit more explicitly and clearly.