



Faculty of Management & Finance, University of Colombo
Manuscript Review Form (Conceptual & Empirical Papers)

Title of the Manuscript:

Name of the Reviewer:

Please comment on the following aspects of the manuscript. Use as much space you need in typing the comments under each section. Please be kind enough to justify/elaborate your major comments and to provide clear suggestions for revisions.

Please note that all your comments and suggestions except those provided under sections 12 and 13 will be sent to the authors. Therefore, ensure that your identity is not revealed in any of the comments or suggestions.

A copy of the reviewer ethics of the CBJ is provided at the end of the review form.

1. Introduction

[Clearly identified, interesting and timely research issue; clearly indicated aim; impressive introduction]

Comments:

Suggestions:

2. Literature Review

[Sufficient review of existing literature, proper flow of arguments]

Comments:

Suggestions:

3. Conceptualization/Theory

[Appropriate use of theory(ies), sound theoretical framework, clearly defined concepts, proper flow of arguments, plausible conceptualizations and logical relationships (if applicable), hypotheses/propositions sufficiently and appropriately supported by literature and flowing from theory or observations (if applicable), clear logic behind the hypotheses/propositions (if applicable), operationalization of variables (if applicable)]

Comments:

Suggestions:

4. Methods (Empirical papers only)

[Justification of research approach and methods for achieving study objectives. Specification of statistical models (if applicable), justification of sample, data collection methods and analytical tools, ensuring quality and trustworthiness of the study (validity, reliability etc. as appropriate for the selected approach)]

Comments:

Suggestions:

5. Analysis, Findings and Discussion (Empirical papers only)

[Correct use of analytical techniques, reporting results in an understandable way, addressing alternative explanations in the analysis, adequate discussion of results in relation to previous literature]

Comments:

Suggestions:

6. Contribution

[Conceptual/theoretical papers: Sufficient conceptual/theoretical extensions to existing knowledge, discussion of implications for scholarly and practicing community, stimulating thought or debate]

[Empirical papers: Novel and value-added contribution to existing research, discussion of implications for scholarly and practicing community, stimulating thought or debate]

Comments:

Suggestions:

7. Title of the Manuscript

[Appropriateness for the study; if not appropriate, your suggestion for revision]

Comments:

Suggestions:

8. Abstract of the Manuscript

[Accurate reflection of the content, sufficient coverage of the study]

Comments:

Suggestions:

9. Keywords

[Accurate and sufficient reflection of the content]

Comments:

Suggestions:

10. Use of Language and Scholarly Presentation

[Clear communication, maintaining proper standard of writing, whether language editing is required]

Comments:

Suggestions:

11. Further Comments and Suggestions (if any):

Comments:

Suggestions:

12. Comments for Editors Eyes Only:

13. Please mark your overall evaluation by underlining the selected response:

Based on the overall evaluation of the manuscript, it is

- (1) Acceptable as it is**
- (2) Acceptable with minor revisions as suggested**
- (3) Acceptable subject to major revision as suggested**
- (4) Rejected**

Reviewer Ethics

- Reviewers should check whether the work is original and unpublished
- Reviewers should not make any attempt at discovering the identities of the authors of the work being reviewed
- Reviewers should maintain confidentiality of information contained in the work.
- Reviewers must be transparent and fair
- Reviewers should not show any biasness irrespective of the subject matter of the work, research philosophy adopted or methodology followed, in the spirit of the multi-disciplinary nature of the CBJ.

Reviewers should disclose any personal relationships that could lead to potential conflict of interest in the review process.