



**Paper: “The Impact of Sustainable Supply Chain Management and Supply Chain Collaboration on Turkish Firms Performance: Moderator Effect of Uncertainty”**

Corresponding Author: Andac Sahinbey Ozkan

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n19p28

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: El Gharbaoui Mohammed  
Université Ibn Tofail, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Mustafa Emre Civelek  
İstanbul Commerce University, Turkey

Published: 31.07.2020

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Mustafa Emre Civelek	
University/Country: İstanbul Commerce University / Turkey	
Date Manuscript Received: 07.07.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 08.07.2020
Manuscript Title: The Impact of Sustainable Supply Chain Management and Supply Chain Collaboration on Turkish Firms Performance: Moderator Effect of Uncertainty	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 06104/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input type="checkbox"/> No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input type="checkbox"/> No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input type="checkbox"/> No	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Open form of PLS should be explained in text. Also in the research methodology, reasons for selecting PLS method should be explained concisely.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Open form of PLS should be explained in text. Also in the research methodology, reasons for selecting PLS method should be explained concisely.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Reviewer Name: <b>EL GHARBAOUI MOHAMMED</b>	Email:
University/Country: <b>Université Ibn Tofail, kenitra, Morocco</b>	
Date Manuscript Received: <b>22/06/2020</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>23/06/2020</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>THE IMPACT OF SUSTAINABLE SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT AND COLLABORATION ON PERFORMANCE: MODERATOR EFFECT OF UNCERTAINTY</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>Paper for review 06104/20</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i>
	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p style="color: red;"><b>The title must reflect the content of the article; “the supply chain collaboration” have to be included instead of “collaboration.” At least the title must be clear that this study is specific on the Turkish context.</b></p> <p style="color: red;"><b>Proposition to help: THE IMPACT OF SUSTAINABLE SUPPLY CHAIN</b></p>	

<b>MANAGEMENT AND SUPPLY CHAIN COLLABORATION ON TURKISH FIRMS PERFORMANCE: MODERATOR EFFECT OF UNCERTAINTY</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>Objects are clear but not the methods and the results</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Include the size of your sample 200 companies /112 responds with 240 usable questionnaire.</b></li> <li>- <b>102 items have no significations, rather to indicate the number of questions or constructs</b></li> <li>- <b>The results indicated are very general and do not reflect the true added value of your studies.</b></li> <li>- <b>Respect the maximum word of 250 (can be solved if you remove the reference;</b></li> <li>- <b>It is desirable that your abstract do not contain any reference.</b></li> <li>- <b>Please check more comments in the manuscript.</b></li> </ul>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Yes, there are few grammatical errors, spelling mistakes, punctuation error and incorrect spaces.</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>It is preferable to argue the choice of the population [the Marmara region], the choice of collecting information through a paper questionnaire instead of using e-mails and the time of this study [from the launch of the questionnaire to the collection of responses).</b>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b><i>Yes, that is very clear, but I recommend the use of paragraph numbering.</i></b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b><i>Yes, but the conclusion needs to be more interesting by adding more content to the results of the study.</i></b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b><i>Yes, but I recommend :</i></b></p> <p><b><i>If there are more than two authors, use the phrase et al. in italics, rather than citing the names of all the authors in parentheses.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>If there are more than two authors, use the term and its collaborators or co-authors in the text, rather than citing the names of all authors.</i></b></p>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>

Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The study is very interesting in terms of value added in the field of supply chain management. Its aim to test and verify six hypotheses at the same time in a single questionnaire is a very courageous piece of work. I would like to encourage collaboration with researchers in other countries to carry out the same study with the same assumptions and the same method of analysis, I will be sure that the results of a study in a number of countries will be very successful.