

Review Form2

Book Name:	Business, Management and Economics: Research Progress
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2405
Title of the Manuscript:	Business Ethics for Global Sustainable Quality Generation in Organisations: Proposing the “BESQ” Scale
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.	The topic is good and very promising. However, the researcher did not conduct thorough literature reviews. The main objectives should be smart. Author should conduct a thorough literature review from current sources, preferably empirical studies done between 2017 to 2024. REFINE THE MAIN OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY Maintain discussions on the variables of study(domain)	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is a good topic. But should be refined. BusinessEthicsforGlobalSustainableQualityGenerationinOrganisations:Proposingthe“BESQ” Scale The topic should appear like this: BusinessEthicsforGlobalSustainableQualityGenerationinOrganisations. Discuss BESQ Scales as a model because the study did not explore the idea as such.	
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 is disorganised and not comprehensive. The abstract should include a brief study background/problem, the main objective, the variables studied, the underpinning model/theory, the methodology, method of analysis , findings, conclusion and recommendation. Should not exceed 350 words.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, there is no coherency in the subsections. The subsection should be presented systematically. Author should conduct a thorough systematic review	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The researcher should have been guided with the study methodology. For example is it analytical review? Is it systematic review? Is it critical appraisal of an existing study?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are not sufficient Since this is purely literature review, some secondary data should be used to show that there exist a problem	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is okay	Just consider editing
Optional/General comments		Author should redo this paper to match a book chapter

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Emily Odhong
Department, University & Country	Kiriri Women’s University of Science and Technology, Kenya