

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **JNBMS-056**

Title: Risk, Resilience and Continuity in Supply Chain Management: A review .

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 002

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The manuscript titled “**Risk, Resilience and Continuity in Supply Chain Management: A Review**” addresses a relevant and important topic in the field of supply chain management by examining supply chain risk management, resilience, agility, and operational performance. The manuscript provides a broad overview of major supply chain risks and explains important concepts such as risk identification, risk assessment, risk treatment, risk monitoring, supply chain resilience, and supply chain agility. The review covers several dimensions of supply chain risk, including operational, environmental, geopolitical, technological, regulatory, demand-supply imbalance, and cybersecurity-related risks, thereby demonstrating the multidimensional nature of contemporary supply chain disruptions. The stated objective of exploring the role of supply chain risk management practices in reducing disruptions and improving resilience and operational performance is appropriate and clearly aligned with the overall subject of the paper. The literature review incorporates a considerable number of academic sources and discusses the major concepts systematically, while the sections on risk treatment—including acceptance, avoidance, transfer, sharing, and mitigation—provide useful conceptual coverage. The conceptual framework is also a positive feature because it attempts to connect risk identification, assessment, treatment, and monitoring with supply chain resilience, agility, and operational performance. However, the manuscript requires some improvements before publication. The methodology needs greater transparency regarding the literature-search process, including the exact search period, screening procedure, number of records initially identified from each database, and the rationale for selecting the final 61 articles. Although the paper states that 80 articles were initially identified and reduced to 61 after

REVIEWER'S REPORT

exclusions, the screening process should be explained more systematically and consistently. The review would also benefit from a stronger critical synthesis rather than primarily presenting definitions and findings from individual studies. The relationship among supply chain risk management, resilience, agility, continuity, and operational performance should be discussed more analytically, with clearer identification of similarities, differences, and theoretical relationships among these constructs. The conceptual framework should be improved in terms of visual clarity and explanatory depth, and the distinction between risk assessment and risk monitoring should be maintained consistently throughout the manuscript. The research-gap section identifies useful areas for further investigation, particularly the need to integrate risk-management processes and examine emerging risks associated with digital technologies, cybersecurity, technological dependency, and information-related vulnerabilities. Nevertheless, the research gap could be strengthened by explicitly linking each identified gap to specific findings from the reviewed literature. The conclusion appropriately emphasizes the strategic importance of effective supply chain risk management, resilience, agility, technological integration, and collaboration. In terms of presentation, several grammatical, spelling, spacing, punctuation, and formatting issues should be carefully corrected throughout the manuscript. Examples include missing spaces between words, inconsistent use of abbreviations, typographical errors, and inconsistent citation/reference formatting. Some references should also be checked carefully for accuracy and consistency with the citations appearing in the main text. A few references appear potentially unrelated to the central supply-chain theme and should be verified for relevance. The manuscript would also benefit from a final language edit to improve sentence construction and academic readability. Overall, the manuscript deals with a significant and contemporary issue and provides a useful foundation through its broad literature coverage and conceptual discussion. With improvements in methodological transparency, critical synthesis, conceptual framework presentation, research-gap development, reference verification, and language/formatting, the paper can make a meaningful contribution to the literature on supply chain risk management and resilience. **Recommendation: Minor Revision.**