

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-130

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Overall Evaluation

The manuscript provides a relevant and timely review of Supply Chain Risk Management (SCRM), supply chain resilience, agility, and operational performance. It discusses different types of supply chain risks and explains major risk-management processes such as identification, assessment, treatment, and monitoring. The conceptual framework is useful in showing the relationship between SCRM, resilience, agility, and operational performance. However, the manuscript requires major revision to improve the review methodology, conceptual clarity, language, references, and overall academic presentation.

Strengths

- The topic is highly relevant given increasing geopolitical, environmental, technological, and operational disruptions.
- The manuscript covers important concepts including risk management, supply chain resilience, supply chain agility, and operational performance.
- The four stages of SCRM—risk identification, assessment, treatment, and monitoring—are explained clearly.
- Different risk treatment strategies such as acceptance, avoidance, transfer, sharing, and mitigation are discussed.
- The paper identifies important contemporary challenges, including technology adoption, cost pressures, regulatory issues, cybersecurity, and supply-demand imbalance.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- The conceptual framework provides a useful link between SCRM, resilience, agility, and operational performance.
- The research gap identifies the need for more integrated research on risk management, resilience, agility, and performance.
- The conclusion provides useful implications for organizations dealing with uncertain and disruptive business environments.

Areas for Improvement

- The review methodology requires greater detail. The authors should clearly explain the search period, search strategy, screening procedure, and eligibility process.
- The manuscript states that 80 articles were initially selected and 61 were finally reviewed, but the screening process should be presented more systematically. A PRISMA flow diagram would strengthen the review.
- There is some inconsistency in the methodology regarding the databases used. The authors should clearly distinguish between academic databases and search platforms such as ResearchGate and Google Scholar.
- The literature review is largely descriptive. It should provide more critical comparison and synthesis of previous studies.
- The conceptual framework needs better explanation, particularly the exact relationship between SCRM, supply chain resilience, agility, and operational performance.
- Some terminology and statements are unclear or incorrect. For example, "Risk Assessment" appears to be used again instead of "Risk Monitoring" in the explanation of the conceptual framework.
- There are several grammatical, spelling, spacing, and typographical errors throughout the manuscript. Careful language editing is required.
- Some citations and references should be carefully verified for author names, publication years, journal details, and DOI information.
- Reference Shukla et al. (2011) appears unrelated to supply chain management and should be reviewed or removed if it is not relevant.
- Some references mentioned in the text should be checked against the reference list for consistency and completeness.
- The title emphasizes "continuity", but business/supply chain continuity is not sufficiently developed as a separate theme. The authors should strengthen this aspect.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- The review would benefit from more recent literature on AI, blockchain, digital twins, cybersecurity, climate risk, and Industry 4.0 in supply chain risk management.
- The practical implications for retailers and supply chain managers should be developed more clearly.