

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_105815
Title of the Manuscript:	Navigating Risk in the Modern Business Landscape: Strategies and Insights for Enterprise Risk Management Implementation
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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. The manuscript can be considered as a great literature review article. It summarizes the related literature in studying ERM. I recommend interviewing a company or multiple companies and studying why the company implemented ERM. Also, the author can review the positive/negative changes of the company after the company implemented the ERM. Most importantly, discuss how the findings contribute to the related literature. 2. No, I suggest mentioning "literature review or summary of literature" in the title so the title will not mislead readers. Or make some changes as I recommended in comment 1. 3. Yes. 4. Yes. 5. No comment since it is a literature review. 6. I recommend including more papers in the area of companies' analysis. Such as Vollmer (2012) Coca-Cola ERM initiative the author mentioned in this article. Overall, it is a great literature review article, and the author should make it clear to readers. Otherwise, I recommend adding some scientific studies to this article.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Xiaoxuan Ji
Department, University & Country	Commonwealth University of PA, United States