

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_97034
Title of the Manuscript:	Network embeddedness and leadership style as determinants of crisis response behaviour
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>Manuscript is fairly strong; the concept of the research is quite relevant and useful for future researchers. Author has used important theories around which research has been built.</p> <p>Title is suitable, it sets the expectations clear.</p> <p>Abstract is to the point highlighting key points of the research. Author could include a line on research design and sample size in abstract. Yes, research structure is appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, Manuscript is logically and scientifically looks correct to my knowledge.</p> <p>Author should use more recent papers in study, most of the references are old.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is good, please run it through language editors software i.e. Grammarly for minor corrections.	
Optional/General comments	The research design, tools are very interesting, use of in vivo is the strength of this paper.	

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:	Kshitiz Sharma
Department, University & Country	ABBS School of Management, India