

**Paper: “Strategy Map Development for the Central Bank of Nepal Using  
Balanced Scorecard”**

**Submitted: 21 October 2020**

**Accepted: 04 January 2021**

**Published: 31 January 2021**

Corresponding Author: Shova Niroula

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n1p88](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n1p88)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

# 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!*

Date Manuscript Received: 19/11/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/11/2020
Manuscript Title: <b>STRATEGY MAP DEVELOPMENT FOR THE CENTRAL BANK OF NEPAL USING BALANCED SCORECARD</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1127/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

## 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>The title is clear and relevant for the paper.</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>I would suggest the authors include a brief background of the research stream. Additionally, the main results of the paper should be addressed and, finally, also the theoretical and practical implications of the study.</i></p>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><i>Thank you for your section. After an in-depth reading, more elements are needed here.</i></p> <p><i>For example, the authors wrote: “This study is a descriptive-survey according to the data collection category because the exploration is done by studying the prevailing situation without changing any variables. On the other hand, according to the result, the study can be considered applied research.” What is the meaning of descriptive-survey studying? In past studies, who perform this method? Authors should cite and add more information about the technique employed for the analysis.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, authors should also motivate why the Central Bank of Nepal is a relevant case study. This information is essential to validate your review.</i></p> <p><i>Please try to answer the following questions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>How do you select people for an interview?</i></li> <li>• <i>What is the period in terms of duration for the interview?</i></li> <li>• <i>How do you analyze all the data?</i></li> <li>• <i>Do you use software for that?</i></li> <li>• <i>How many people do you involve and why that number? Please motivate.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>About the questionnaire:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>What kind of questions do you do?</i></li> <li>• <i>What are questions retrieved from a research protocol?</i></li> <li>• <i>What is Cronbach’s alfa? Why is it relevant here?</i></li> </ul> <p><i>I suggest the reading of previous studies with this method, for instance:</i></p> <p><i>Aguinis, H., &amp; Solarino, A. M. (2019). Transparency and replicability in qualitative research: The case of interviews with elite informants. Strategic Management Journal, 40(8), 1291-1315.</i></p> <p><i>Malterud, K., Siersma, V. D., &amp; Guassora, A. D. (2016). Sample size in qualitative interview studies: guided by information power. Qualitative health research, 26(13), 1753-1760.</i></p>	

<b>5. The results are precise and do not contain errors.</b>	
<p><i>Due to the lack of the method, all the results are complicated to understand. Authors probably here should explain and more in-depth the analysis. They are too briefly.</i></p> <p><i>Table 3 should move from the results section to the conclusion section. And results do not address all the aims that authors write in the introduction section.</i></p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	
<p><i>The conclusion section should be restructured considering:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. The aim of this study.</i></li> <li><i>2. The results obtained after a brief discussion on them.</i></li> <li><i>3. The main theoretical and practical implications (almost present, but authors should more profound the theoretical part on it considering more recent links with the literature.</i></li> <li><i>4. The authors should add limitations to the study.</i></li> <li><i>5. In the end, also, future research strategies are needed.</i></li> </ol>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
<p><i>References should be improved, considering more on topic and young research papers.</i></p>	

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

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

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

Considering the **introduction section**, some elements can be addressed more. For instance, the authors start with a good definition of Balance Scorecard (BSC). However, this section should also be stressed more why it is necessary to further studies about that. There is an initial explanation about the GAP, but authors should strengthen more, citing adequate references which suggested more studies in the banking field. Additionally, in the introduction section, I would recommend the authors adding:

- Briefly, how they conduct the analysis (methodology);
- Theoretical and practical implications obtained;
- How it is structured the paper (2/3 lines with a map of the article).

Considering the **literature review section**, I believe that several recent studies are missing. The literature is focusing on ten years ago literature. Authors should extend their analysis, also considering more recent publications. Below some useful and constructive examples:

- Hamdy, A. (2018). Balance scorecard role in the competitive advantage of Egyptian banking sector. *The Business & Management Review*, 9(3), 424-434.
- Wu, H. Y. (2012). Constructing a strategy map for banking institutions with key performance indicators of the balanced scorecard. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 35(3), 303-320.
- Pakurár, M., Haddad, H., Popp, J., Khan, T., & Oláh, J. (2019). Supply chain integration, organizational performance and balanced scorecard: An empirical study of the banking sector in Jordan. *Journal of International Studies Vol*, 12(2).
- Abofaied, A. (2017). Evaluation of Bank's Performance by using Balanced Score card: practical study in Libyan Environment. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(1), 1-14.

The part of the literature which considers the central bank of Nepal is relevant to create a background of the study.

All the best,  
The reviewer

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