



Supply Chain Pulse

Dear Reviewer,

You may please...

1. complete the review within 4-6 weeks,
2. return the completed MEF to: editor@supplychainpulse.org
3. return the material if you cannot or desire to review this paper;
4. evaluate manuscript on merit,
5. use "Comments for Authors" sheet, which will be forwarded to the author,
6. express your opinion for acceptance or rejection under "*Confidential Comments to Editor*"

Regards,

Chief Editor, Supply Chain Pulse

MANUSCRIPT EVALUATION FORM (MEF)

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Reviewer's Name: | |
| E-mail: | |
| Date sent to reviewer: | Date expected from reviewer: |

| |
|-----------------------|
| Paper title: |
| Manuscript / Job No.: |

Reviewer's comments

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. The originality of the paper. | Unsatisfactory | Poor | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comment: | | | | | |
| 2. Novelty of the concept. | Unsatisfactory | Poor | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comment: | | | | | |
| 3. The theoretical framework and research design of the paper. | Unsatisfactory | Poor | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comment: | | | | | |
| 4. Appropriateness of methodology. | Unsatisfactory | Poor | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comment: | | | | | |



5. Quality and the adequacy of literature review.

Unsatisfactory Poor Good Very Good Excellent

Comment:

6. Novelty of findings.

Unsatisfactory Poor Good Very Good Excellent

Comment:

7. Validation of findings and solution.

Unsatisfactory Poor Good Very Good Excellent

Comment:

8. Academic or managerial implications.

Unsatisfactory Poor Good Very Good Excellent

Comment:

9. Contributions to the literature.

Unsatisfactory Poor Good Very Good Excellent

Comment:

10. Reliability and quality of referencing.

Unsatisfactory Poor Good Very Good Excellent

Comment:

11. Scope for further research.

Unsatisfactory Poor Good Very Good Excellent

Comment:

Overall Evaluation:

- 1. Outstanding
- 2. Definitely publishable
- 3. Probably publishable
- 4. Marginally publishable
- 5. Un-publishable

Recommendation:

- 1. Accept as it is
- 2. Requires minor corrections
- 3. Requires moderate revision
- 4. Requires major revision
- 5. Submit to another publication

Confidential comments to the editor

(This will not be forwarded to the authors:



Comments for author(s)

Submit the form to Chief Editor: editor@supplychainpulse.org
